

UC-NRLF



\$B 365 356



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

INTRODUCTION

TO AN

ANALYTICAL DICTIONARY.

СОГЛАСОВАТЬ

УЧАСТИЕ ВАСИЛИЯ

INTRODUCTION
TO AN
ANALYTICAL DICTIONARY
OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE:
BY
DAVID BOOTH.

Il seroit à désirer qu'on ne considérât les premières éditions des livres, que comme des essais informes que ceux qui en sont auteurs proposent aux personnes de lettres, pour en apprendre leurs sentiments.

L'ART DE PENSER.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

AND SOLD BY W. & J. DEAS, EDINBURGH; J. JOHNSON,
AND VERNOR & HOOD, LONDON.

1806.

THE
ENGLISH
DICTIONARY

W. G.

THE ENGLISH DICTIONARY

W. G.

THE ENGLISH DICTIONARY

W. G.

Entered in Stationers Hall.

PE1591
A2B59

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN the month of December last, the Author published a “Prospectus of an Analytical Dictionary of the English Language.” In announcing his plan, it was proposed to arrange the vocables into classes: beginning with the explanation of the Root, and proceeding with its compounds. The composition of English words presents a considerable degree of regularity. The signification of a Primitive is varied, by the addition of an extensive list of *Prefixes* and *Terminations*; such as *ad*, *con*, *sub*;—*ary*, *ation*, *ment*, &c. These are words as susceptible of accurate definition as any other; but their explanation, or how they modify the original idea, if given wherever they occur, would serve only to swell the work by useless tautology; and it was therefore

ADVERTISEMENT.

therefore proposed to comprehend their definitions, with a grammatical sketch of the language, in an INTRODUCTION. Circumstances having hitherto retarded the publication of the Dictionary, and rendered the period of its appearance uncertain, the Introduction is, now, offered to the public. Having a separate title, it may be considered, either as an independent work, or as an advanced part of that of which it is the harbinger.

NEWBURGH, NOVEMBER 1, 1805.

ERRATA.

PAGE 29, to the first marginal Note, add, of Verbs.
— 33, line 3, for circumlocutary read circumlocutory.
— 47, — 5, for *Fiere* read *Fieri*.
— 71, — 9, for a kin read akin.
— 88, — 27, for “*that*” read “*that.*”
— 89, Catchword, for sings, read signs.
— 104, line last, for &c. *active*, read *active*, &c.
— 108, — 22, for groupe read group.
— 116, — 2, for abase read a base.
— 121, — 5, for analogous read *analogous*.
— 138, — 16, after, probably, insert, the.

卷之三

INTRODUCTION

TO AN

ANALYTICAL DICTIONARY.

THOUGH it is exceedingly probable that the art of communicating ideas, by articulated sounds, has existed among mankind, in their earliest stages of society, yet it is not till a considerable progress is made in civilization, that the examination of those sounds, which form the language of a people, is raised to the rank of a Science. The oral transmission of thought must have been too fleeting to command minute attention ; and written signs of ideas must have been invented, before the combination of words and sentences could have attracted sufficient notice, to become the subject of grammatical investigation. Indeed, the art of writing must have been much advanced, before that of grammar could have commenced ; and those sages, who first formed the breathing page, were, probably, unacquainted with the formidable phalanx of Nouns and Verbs, which now stand, in dread array, to guard the avenues to the groves of academus.

Probable origin of Grammar.

Its nature.

The science of words differs, in kind, from those which relate to the objects of nature. He who utters a sound to express a thought, or writes a word which may recall the idea, (in the same manner as the painting on the canvas renews the impression of the scene which it represents,) must completely comprehend the articulations of his voice, or of his pen. No classification, or philological disquisition, can change, or render more accurate, the meaning of the words which formed the dialect of our untutored ancestors. The Naturalist, from patience of research, becomes more intimately acquainted with the properties of the plant, or mineral, to which his attention is directed, and this addition to his knowledge is a discovery in the science ; but the study of grammar, like that of the Antiquarian, is rather productive of information than invention. It is less the creation of what is new than the search for those things which are forgotten.

Difference
of
Languages.

Language, being used for the communication of thought, must necessarily be the same among the different members of the same society ; and, it will be cultivated, in proportion as the society is extended in numbers, or in its relations with others. We find nations separated from each other by seas and rivers, by customs and by laws ; and we find the same diversity in their tongues as in their situation, or their manners. With the origin of this division of nations and of languages, we are but imperfectly

imperfectly acquainted. Both have been subjects of much disquisition, but much yet remains to be explained. It is sufficient for our present purpose, to mark those facts which are indubitable: That, of some countries, the modes of speech are so similar as to bear evidence of their inhabitants having, originally, been the same; whereas, of others, the utmost ingenuity would, in vain, attempt to find a single trait of resemblance.

From the revolutions of nations, either in manners or in situation, have arisen the changes and corruptions of their languages. Originally simple and uniform in their structure, the influx of foreign customs and dialects are incorporated with the early tongues, and generate a complication of phraseology, which the half-instructed rustic can, with difficulty, comprehend. Such, at present, are most of the languages of Europe, and we, partially, enter into the region of conjecture, when we endeavour to ascertain what they have been. We may, however, form some opinion from general analogy; and, should what we gather from thence prove useful, in our etymological researches, the stability of its foundation may be the less regarded.

Ideas are the reflected images of nature. Words are the pictures of ideas. Simplicity of thought will produce simplicity of expression; and hence the individual impulses of the mind will be marked by monosyllabic sounds. Two or more simple impressions form what is termed a complex idea,

Causes of
the com-
plexity of
their struc-
ture.

Composi-
tion of
Words.

which is expressed by as many primitive words. If this complex idea be of general recurrence, the syllables by which it is denoted will, by habit of pronunciation, be joined together, so as to form a compound word with different articulations. All this is hypothesis, but we find it confirmed by an analysis of the languages with which we are acquainted.

Resting, therefore, upon this theory, all words of one syllable are to be considered as primitives, unless, from a complexity of signification and probable etymology, any of them shall appear to have been originally polysyllables corrupted by time. On the other hand, every word of more than one syllable will be considered as a compound, formed by the conjunction of two or more simple words: Thus, *Gold* and *Smith* are primitives, forming together the complex term *Goldsmith*, the signification of which may be easily deduced from the parts of its composition.

While we confine our attention to those polysyllables, which are made up of words in general use, their composition appears evident; but living tongues are in a state of perpetual fluctuation; foreign words are gradually adopted, while many of the natives are suffered to slide into oblivion, and hence, the compounds remain, though their formatives may be no more. Another fruitful source of such words may be traced to the imagined necessity of literary men. They become en-
amoured

amoured of languages that have been acquired by difficulty; and what they suppose too vulgar or antiquated in their mother tongue, is supplanted by another, known only in writings which have survived the wreck of ages. During some centuries immediately previous to the invention of printing, immured in the gloom of a monastery, Science seemed an alien in the land of her residence. She appeared in a garb which concealed her from the knowledge of the vulgar; or, if she deigned to assume the dress of her country, it was so disfigured by the trappings of antiquity, as to be known only to a few.

It is when a language has arrived at this state of complicity and commixture, that men of genius begin to turn their attention to the intricacies of its composition, and the anomalies of its structure. These arise from the conjunction of words individually unknown, some of which are observed regularly to recur; and certain syllables termed, from their situation, *prepositions* and *terminations*, are found to vary the signification of the radical word, in a determinate manner. For the junction of these syllables, in some cases, rules are laid down, while the marks themselves, which thus alter the original idea of a word, are generally treated as unmeaning, or, at least, as incapable of definition. Verbs, (or words expressive of action,) are, in many languages, subjected to a multiplied variety of forms. In English they receive few

changes, their different moods and tenses being expressed by other words, termed auxiliaries, which are known and separately used, excepting two or three affixes, afterwards to be explained. In the Greek, Latin, French, &c. the auxiliaries and agents, necessary to the change of situation, or idea, are joined to the principal part of the verb, and incorporated, or contracted, in such a manner as to render it almost impossible to trace them to their origin. Perhaps some future Grammarian may explore those mazes of perplexity; and Philology, guided by a more certain and steady light, shall no longer wander among the inextricable wilds of declensions and conjugations.

Their
grammati-
cal ar-
range-
ment.

In treating of subjects that contain a multiplicity of particulars, the memory is apt to be bewildered, in a chaos of similar objects, where none has a claim to pre-eminence. To avoid this confusion, a certain arrangement is necessary. The Botanist must have his classes and orders—The Chemist his bodies simple and compounded. In the dawnings of knowledge, the mode of classification must partake of the darkness of general information; and succeeding writers might have been sensible of the faults of the systems of their predecessors, without possessing the daring, or the ability, to propose, or to establish, an improvement. It was reserved for a Linnæus, a Lavoisier, and a Tooke, to build anew the temple of Science, and to replace the Gothic arches and gloomy vaults, by the

the elegant and cheerful structures of modern taste. It is sometime, however, before the rising fane can attract the worship of the crowd. The spirit of prejudice, like the ghosts of the departed, loves to linger near to mouldering walls, under the covert of the night.

In our observations on language, therefore, while we mark what appears to be the most natural division of the subject, we shall attend, particularly, to that order and enunciation which have, hitherto, most generally obtained; and, that we may not trifle with the reader, we shall suppose him acquainted with the common English Grammars of the Schools.

Much useless discussion has appeared concerning the different kinds of words. They correspond with the nature of our ideas, and must follow the course of their operations. An investigation, into the composition of language, is resolvable into an inquiry, concerning the abstractions and classifications of the human mind. A loose collection of materials is viewed with emotions of aversion. We love to rear the ruined fabric;—to generalize and to arrange the objects of our knowledge.

The first natural division of Words is NAMES, OF NOUNS. or what are termed SUBSTANTIVES or NOUNS. The sound, or syllable, which brings directly to our recollection any object in nature, is its *name*: such as *Man, Bird, Beast, Tree*, which are *general*, as being each applicable to a class of which there may

may be many individuals, as *John*, a *Lark*, an *Oak*. — Nouns of two or more syllables, are compound words, formed from some relation, real or imaginary, observed between them and the primitives, first denominated, as, *Woman*, *Eagle*, *Tyger*, *Cypress*. Others have their syllabic additions still unincorporated, as, *Black-Smith*, *Wheel-Wright*, *Apple-Tree*, and, generally, all those whose divisions form simple words, still used in the language. Nouns, or Names, comprehend every thing that exists, and, in a certain sense, include every other division of words.

OF ADJECTIVES.

Things that we perceive to exist, must possess some *qualities*, which render their existence known to the human mind. Something must act upon the senses before objects can be perceptible, if we allow the operations of a material universe, which, here, cannot be denied; for, on the basis of this belief, the whole structure of language is erected. *Qualities*, as a division of words, have been, in general, known by the name of ADJECTIVES, though part of them have been included under other denominations. Objects are distinguished by their *extension*, *figure*, *colour*, &c, and, hence, *big*, *round*, *white*, &c. are Adjectives. It is evident that these words do not express *things*, but *modes*. They apply not to the principle, but to the marks, or energies, of existence; and, for aught that language denotes to the contrary, the ideal relations which they express may exist, either in the mind that perceives,

or

or in the substance that originates the perception. All Adjectives, however, may, in a certain respect, be considered as Nouns. We may view a quality as a thing of itself, independent on the substance to which it is joined. *Good* may be considered as varying in degree, and *White* may be clear or muddy. Such cases may be explained by supposing a Noun to be understood, not expressed, in the sentence; or, the words may be treated as Nouns. This applies to all the kinds of Adjectives to be afterwards considered. We have *Perpendicular*, *Opponent*, *Learning*, &c. all originally *Adjectives*, but now, also used with the signification of *Nouns*.

We are well aware that, philosophically considered, the separation of *quality* from *substance* involves a contradiction. Yet, after all, it is with *qualities alone* that we are acquainted; and we know nothing of the essence or substratum of a Being, different from the *collection* of appearances which it is known to possess. To speak of a *quality*, then, unconnected with a *substance*, is merely to view that substance under *one* of its relations. The Mathematician reasons on the properties of *Numbers*; but these must be joined with other relations; they must be applied to things with which the senses are otherwise conversant, before they can be useful, in the progress of life.

Nature of abstraction.

Hitherto we have only considered the Names of ~~VERBS~~ and Qualities of Things, but these things perform certain

certain functions in the world. Words, that express *the state or action of things*, are usually denominated VERBS; and this designation (though improper etymologically considered,) has been so generally in use among writers on grammar, that it might be inconvenient to substitute another.—It is evident that words expressing the relations of *action*, if neither the *agent* nor the *patient* be mentioned, must be, simply, the *names* of such *actions*; and, therefore, *Love*, *Hatred*, *Joy*, and *Grief*, belong to the class of Nouns.—To specify that these passions are put into play, the idea of *action* is joined, either by a separated word, by a prefix, or, by a termination. Thus we have *To Love*, *To Hate*, *To Enjoy*, *To Grieve*, which are originally the same with *Do Love*, *Do Hate*, *Do Enjoy*, *Do Grieve*; or, *Act Love*, *Act Hate*, *Act Joy*, *Act Grief*, as will be more fully explained in an after part of this Introduction, and, under the different articles *Act* and *Do*, in the Dictionary. In other cases the mark of *action* is affixed to the Verbal Noun, as, *I Loved*, *He Loves*, or *Loveth*; the terminations *ed*, *es*, and *eth*, performing the same part as the separate particles *did*, *does*, and *doth*:—but of this we shall treat more fully hereafter.—Sometimes, for the sake of supposed elegance, the *to* and *do* are suppressed, as, *I Love*, in place of *I Do Love*; and this mode of writing, now, prevails, in many cases, where authors of only half a century ago employed the auxiliary, “*He bade them to open their bundles*,” is a sentence

tence written by Dr Smollet, though the *to* would, at this time, be regarded as redundant.

In every expression of action there are an agent and a patient. The action is to be endured as well as exerted, and, therefore, the *passive* state, *I Am*, *I Exist*, *I Sleep*; &c. as well as the phrases, *I am Loved*, *I am Hated*, &c. are included under the head of Verbs; though, in the latter examples, the word *am* alone is a Verb, *loved* and *hated* being Adjectives. The fact is, that as an Adjective is nothing else but the *name* of a *quality*, so a Verb is only the *name* of an *action*, or *state of being*; and Vide BE. its apparent variations of form are occasioned, solely, by its connexion with other words which denote that the *action* of the Verb is *exerted*. All the moods and tenses, of the Greek and Latin, have arisen from the difficulty of analysing the multiplied combinations of words, which are contained in the classic writers of antiquity; and the modern tongues, whose involved and twisted chains might more easily be unravelled, have had their Grammars formed by minds, enthusiastically attached to the systems of the ancient schools.

As *things* have various *qualities*, and produce that class of words termed Adjectives, so there must be different *modes* or *manners* of *action*, producing a division of words that have been called ADVERBS. These are generally Adjectives, with the addition of *ly* or *like*, to shew their correspondence with the Verb. Thus, *I love WISELY*, or *WISE-LIKE*, or *like*

Passive
VERBS.

Of
ADVERBS.

like a wise man. It is evident that this is no new class of words, but a comparison of *qualities*, where one of the Substantives, or Nouns, is understood. Adjectives and Adverbs are, therefore, the same kind of words; and, where it is unnecessary to mark the comparison, the Adjective is used without any inflection, as, *I loved him MUCH*;—*I did it WELL.*

Of PARTI-
CIPLES.

PARTICIPLES are compound words, expressing the *quality* of being the *agent* or the *object* of an action; and must, also, be considered as Adjectives which owe their verbal signification to their affixes; as, *loving* and *drowned* are formed by the *active* additions of *ing* and *ed*. Were we to adhere to the classification of *simple* words alone, these, as a kind of phrases, or junction of ideas, should be discarded.

Of PRO-
NOUNS.

When speaking of Adjectives, we should have noticed a particular genus, respecting which, Grammarians have been at a loss to guess, whether they were Nouns, or to what other class they belonged. They have therefore, as is the general practice in such cases of difficulty, assigned to them a separate department, under the denomination of PRO-NOUNS; because they are used in the place of Nouns. They are in fact, nothing but Adjectives, or qualities, though now often used without the Substantive, which is understood; and, in that case, by an easy transition, are raised to the rank of imaginary personages, and treated as if they were

Substantives

Substantives themselves. This, however, was not formerly so common ; and in legal instruments, where language of three centuries old is employed, their Substantives are generally conjoined. Instead of the ordinary phrase, “ *He struck him*,” they say, “ *He, the said A B, struck him, the said C D*,” marking the persons to whom the Pronouns refer. *This*, or *that*, as particularly specify an object, as its colour, or its form ; and, *I* and *you*, as distinctly discriminate between the *speaker* and the *bearer*.

The words *a* (or *an*,) and *the*, though they have been considered as a part of speech, distinct from every other, under the name of ARTICLES, are of the species last mentioned. The first is the numeral *one* ; and it is surprising, that the latter should ever have been separated from the class of Pronouns. In all languages, when speaking of things, there is a necessity for limitation. *A*, or *an*, expresses that we speak of *one* such thing as the Noun describes ; while *the* is almost equivalent to *that*, and denotes the person, or thing, of which, from other circumstances, we have some acquaintance. Those tongues which are supposed to want Articles will, on examination, be found to possess these definitives, either separately, in their prefixes, or in their terminations *.

OF ARTICLES.

From

* “ The Latin *quis* is evidently \approx *o* ; and the Latin terminations *us*, *a*, *um*, no other than the Greek article *o*, *η*, *ον*.”

Of PREPO-
SITIONS
and CON-
JUNCTIONS

From fifty to sixty other words, which could not easily be brought within the limits of any of the preceding divisions, have been formed into two separate classes, termed PREPOSITIONS and CONJUNCTIONS, as is said, from their being used *before* Nouns, and for *conjoining* words, or sentences. All these have been examined, by Mr Horne Tooke, in his *Diversions of Purley*, and shewn to be merely Verbs, or Nouns, whose other parts, or compounds, are, in general, not to be found in the language; for which reason the task of fixing their accurate signification becomes the more laborious. Whether or not he has, in all cases, been equally successful, it is not now our business to inquire. An etymological discussion of these words would, here, be out of place, since the opportunity will again occur, under their different heads in the Dictionary. It is sufficient, for our present purpose, that *and*, *but*, *yet*;—*from*, *to*, *with*, and the like, have a signification, of their own, independent on their connection in the sentence where they are found; and this, Mr Tooke has clearly demonstrated. If, then, each has a *meaning*, and is capable of raising an idea in the mind, that idea must have its prototype in nature. It must either denote *an exertion*, and is, therefore, *a Verb*; or *a quality*, and is, in that case, *an Adjective*; or, it must express *an assemblage of qualities*, such as is observed to belong to *some individual object*, and is, on this supposition, the *name* of such *object*, or *a Noun*.

The

The only class of words which remains to be considered is **INTERJECTIONS**, and these must always belong to some of the divisions already mentioned. When the mind is overpowered by passion, (or violence of feeling,) unconnected words and broken sentences are uttered: But every such word, or sentence, is an Interjection, and has its meaning by completing the sentence, with those words which are unexpressed. In English, a few sounds, as *Oh! fie! alas! &c.* which will be defined in their order, are particularly used for the expression of exclamation, arising from the impulse of *astonishment, aversion, pain*, or other emotions. But, beside these, any other word, or phrase, such as, "*Wonderful!*" "*How wretched!*" &c. may become an Interjection, and, in this, it does not change its nature, but, merely, from its disjointed and *interjected* situation in the page, marks the powerful influence of some overwhelming passion, in the speaker's mind.

We have, thus, given an account of the different divisions of words, and have found that the whole may be classed under the three heads of *Names, Qualities, and Actions*; or, *Nouns, Adjectives, and Verbs*. We might now proceed to the prosecution of the plan of the Dictionary, which is to attempt to explain the simple words; (or those of a single syllable, expressive of an individual thought,) and, along with every such explanation, to note its various compounds, and mark the addition to the original

OF INTER-
JECTIONS.

OF PREFIX-
ES and
TERMINA-
TIONS.

original idea which every PREFIX or TERMINATION exhibits. Previously, however, in observing these compounds, a system of regularity presents itself, which, if properly attended to, may, in a material degree, shorten our future labours. The particles, which alter the form of the primitive word, are not added to one root alone, but to many; and, if we can fix their meaning as applicable to a single case, the explanation will be the same in whatever combinations they may be found. Should we discover that a particular Termination, or Prefix, has a certain definitive signification; and, if it be found attached to a variety of simple words, that signification, once determined, may be referred to in every case where it shall occur, and will save the trouble of unnecessary repetition. We shall, therefore, examine the different compositions of words, with each of the affixes, as far as they possess sufficient uniformity to render the examination useful to our design:—And if, in our progress, we deviate from the proper direction, let it be remembered that we have to wander over a pathless plain, on which preceding travellers have, seldom, reared a single stone, or planted a solitary shrub, to mark where they have been.

Of the Plural Affix *es*,
is, or *s*.

The most general addition, to the form and signification of a Noun, is the mark of the Plural, which is usually formed by the affix *s*, formerly spelt *es*, or *is*. The power of this termination is obvious, but its origin, being coeval with the language,

guage, renders it impossible to trace, with certainty, where, or when, it has been used in its unconnected state. It is probably much corrupted ; and, indeed, this may be the case in many compositions of syllables : so much so, that, were one of our ancestors, who existed in the earlier ages of our tongue, to review the grammatical investigations of our time, he might smile at the labours of the Etymologist. If, however, the meanings of the several adjuncts can be distinctly ascertained so as to apply universally wherever they may be found, the end of utility will be gained. If the problem can be solved, we may be pardoned the inaccuracy of its demonstration.

TIME, or the measure of the duration of existence, was, originally, in most nations, calculated by the flux and reflux of the ocean. This, which with us is termed the *tide*, was formerly synonymous with *time*. The Saxon word *tide* signified *time* only, and several of our compounds, expressive of stated periods, have the affix *tide* : such as *Whitsuntide*, *Martinmastide*, *Noontide*, &c. From the same cause the Romans expressed by the word *Tempestas*, either *time*, a sea-storm, or destruction. The regular recurrence and similarity of the *tides*, may have suggested the idea of using the word as indicative of *multitude of the same kind*, and a word denoting these changes of the sea may have originated the plural terminations. The particle *ce*, anciently spelt *es*, forms a termination in several

Tide and time.

words, and has this signification of *time* : Thus *once*, *twice*, and *thrice*, are equivalent to *one time*, *two times*, and *three times* ; and, when these numerals are extended, we use the word *times*, as, *four times*, *five times*, &c. The Germans express *once*, *twice*, &c. by *einmal*, *zweimal*, &c. the word *mal* in their language having the power of the French *fois* and our *TURN*, or *time*, applied to the repetition of an event. The varied spelling of *ce* and *es* is of no moment, for, as we formerly had *ones*, *twies*, and *thries*, marking the addition of *es* to *one*, *twie*, and *thrie*, so we now have some of our plurals, as *dice*, *mice*, and *pence*, ending in *ce*. It is, therefore, not improbable that *ce*, or *es*, is synonymous with *time*, in its numeral signification ; and, as added to *one*, *two*, or *three*, it expresses *how many* of these things, or actions, are exhibited, so, if employed in simple connection with the name of a thing, it may denote a number of such things, leaving the extent indefinite.

En.

Another regular mark of plurality is *en*, as in *oxen*, *brethren*, *children*, &c. This termination was formerly much more common than now, as *housen* for *houses* ; *eyen* for *eyes* ; *foxen* for *foxes*, &c. The affix *en*, in the ordinary acceptation of *time*, is also found in several words.—For example : *when* and *then* are evidently from the Saxon *hwæt* and *theo*, joined to the syllable *en*, and signify *what time* and *that time*. Besides, the French *en*, equivalent to our *in*, implies *time*, as will be explained when treating

treating of *in* as a preposition. Thus the plural affixes, *es* and *en*, are apparently derived from a similar source; but, whatever be their origin, their meaning, in both cases, is the same, that is, *Number without any particular limitation*.

There are some anomalies in English plurals. A few are literally adopted from other languages, and preserve their original form, such as, *errata* and *phenomena*, from *erratum* and *phenomenon*, while others form their plural in the middle of the word, adding a separate termination to both numbers, as *man* and *men*; *tooth* and *teeth*; *foot* and *feet*; but all these will be better explained as they occur in the Dictionary. In the mean time, we may observe of *es*, that the *e* is now left out wherever the word will admit of contracting the syllable. Thus we have *skins*, *bells*, and *chairs*, as the plurals of *skin*, *bell*, and *chair*; but when the Nouns end in the sound of *s*, or so as an *s* cannot easily be incorporated with its concluding syllable, the *es* is added, and therefore *box*, *kiss*, *sash*, and *church*, become *boxes*, *kisses*, *sashes*, and *churches*.

The syllable *en* has other applications than that above-mentioned. It likewise expresses action, and has the signification of *make*, or *made*, as in *golden*, or *silken*, which specifies that a thing is *made* of *gold*, or of *silk*. In this sense it is often applied to form past participles, as *proven*, *arisen*, *given*, &c. signifying that the action is *finished* or *made*, as is also expressed by the termination *ed*. *Ed* is used

Plural affixes different from the preceding.

Variations of *es*.

Other uses of *en*.

Distinction
between *ed*
and *en*.

indiscriminately to declare that the action was *doing* or *done*; but *en* has the latter sense only, and forms the termination of *done* as compounded from *do*. *En* or *an* terminates the infinitive of almost all the Saxon and Teutonic Verbs, indicating *action* in the same manner as our *to*. With us it is occasionally prefixed, as, *to encrease*, *to make bigger*; *to encourage*, *to make courageous*; and, notwithstanding of its *Verbal* power, we have added the *to* and other signs of exertion, in conformity with the general analogy of our language. In adopting words from another tongue such a redundancy is common. To the connective syllable, contained in the *Vocab*le which we have chosen, we often join a similar particle of our own. This is in some degree necessary, otherwise our Syntax would become a patch-work, and we should multiply our idioms, already too numerous. As examples of this adaptation of foreign words, we might instance most of the Latin derivatives that contain a preposition. Thus, *to abstain* and *to connect* mean *to hold from* and *to join together*, their former syllables *abs* and *con* being equal to our *from* and *with*; yet, in composition, we say *to abstain FROM* and *to connect WITH*, which, critically examined, are apparent pleonasms. It is hence that the inseparable prepositions have been, in some cases, supposed to *encrease* the signification of Verbs, while, in others, they have been regarded as *expletives*. The latter opinion is general with regard to the prefix of which

we

we have been treating. It will always, however, be found to signify *make*; and *to enjoy*, *to encounter*, *to endeavour*, &c. will thus have evident meanings.

Many also of our Verbs have *en* post-fixed, as *to lengthen*, *to make longer*, *to shorten*, *to make shorter*, *to soften*, *to make soft*, &c. and, in general, those Verbs whose roots are Adjectives require this mode of formation. When the word to which *en* is affixed terminates with an *r*, it is usual to neglect the middle *e*, in consequence of the coalescence of the liquids *r* and *n*. Thus *leatheren* becomes *leathern*, *southeren*, *southern*, and *to waren*, *to make aware*, becomes *to warn*. In a similar manner *wintery*, *fostering*, *wandering*, &c. have been barbarously mutilated by the poets.

After all, *en* as a plural termination, with our definition of its being synonymous with *time*, does not appear to differ materially from its meaning of *make* or *made*, *do* or *done*. *TIME* as an abstract being is a non-entity; and, when we apply the word in language, it must, like an Adjective, be joined to something else, before it can convey an image to the mind. Before the word can have any meaning, we must connect it with other circumstances, and say what passed at the period to which we allude. “The French Revolution happened “in the *time*”—In the *time* of *what*? “In the “*time* of George the third,” or, *when* he was King of Great Britain. The occurrence of one

Of *en* as a
termination

Ern.

Connexion
of the dif-
ferent uses
of *en*.

thing is the only mark by which we can fix the period of the existence of another. One event must always be *before, in, or after*, that portion of duration in which a different one was *happening, or had happened*; and all Particles, since they denote that an action is *doing, or done*, may, in consequence, express the relations of *time*.

Of *in.*

In and *en* as prefixes are often confounded. The Greek and French preposition *en* corresponds with our *in*, but in English the words ought to be distinguished, which can be done with accuracy and ease. *In* signifies *situation*, and originally must have meant the particular *spot* where a thing was *situated*. In this sense it may always be explained by the word *place*, which, without injury to the meaning of the sentence, may be substituted in its stead. For instance, “I was *in* the house,” and “I was *place* the house;” “I went *into* the garden,” and “I went to *place* the garden,” are, respectively, synonymous. “I did it *in* consequence of his advice.”—Here the *situation*, or *time*, consequent with his advice, is personified, or rather specified; and it is stated that it was *then*, or in *that time*, (viewing the extent of *time* figuratively as a *place*) that the action was done. All words applying to *local* connection may also be applied to the *measure* of the succession of events. *Space* and *Duration*, with equal power, preside over and include within their dominion all the actions of the Universe. *Place* and *Time*, with delegated authority,

rity, are the corresponding Rulers of the World ; and, so similar is their sway, that they are perpetually mistaken for one another. *In*, therefore, is also used to signify *time*, and when so used, the word *time* will always be completely equivalent. Thus we may say, “ I went to London, *in* two “ hours,” or, “ I went to London, *time* two “ hours,” with equal meaning and propriety.

From the foregoing definitions, the distinction between *in* and *en* will be evident. *To inclose* will signify *to close in*, or *to close a place*, and *to enclose*, will be simply *to make close*; *to inquire* will be to seek *in* or to search the *place*, and *to enquire* will mean *to make search*. This distinction is, however, not attended to by the generality of writers, as they use indifferently either the *in* or *en* prefixed to Verbs.

In, as a prefix, also marks *negation*; and, in this sense it has, by some, been supposed to come from the Hebrew *ain*, signifying *not*; but the pronunciation, and even the power of the letters, of this language being completely lost, must render its imagined derivations extremely uncertain. *In* was employed by the Romans, in this privative manner, when joined to Nouns or Participles, and is equivalent to the word *not*: as, *indecent*, is *not* decent, *intemperate* is *not* temperate, and so of others. It is from the constitution of the word to which it is joined, and not from any transforming power of the preposition *in*, that such compounds *reverse* the idea of the primary. Though *not* decent, or *indecent*,

Distinction
between *in*
and *en*.

Another use
of *in*.

cent, be merely the *negation* of *decent*, yet, as there can be no medium in such a case, the one is directly opposite to the other.

Of *un.*

Synonymous with the negative *in* is the prefix *un*. It is of Saxon origin, and more generally joined to words that flow from the Gothic source, while *in* is oftener applied to such as are of Latin derivation. The Dutch *wan*, evidently our word *want*, has the same power in composition as *un*, and most probably is its original. The Scotch have also *wan*, using *wanwordy* for *unworthy*, and the pendulum of a clock is by them termed the *wanrest*. When *in* or *un* is annexed to Verbs, it does not only signify that the action is *not* performed, but that it is *reversed*. *To ravel* is to twist and confuse; to *unravel* is to separate what has been *ravelled*. The reason is obvious:—One Verb cannot be the negative of another, because the *want of action* would divest it of its verbal nature, and the privative particle must therefore mark opposition.

Em for *en*,
and *ig*, *il*,
im, and *ir*,
for *in*.

En is sometimes, in composition, spelt *em*, and *in* is spelt *ig*, *il*, *im*, or *ir*, according to the various initials of the words to which the prefix is joined; and these irregularities depend on the supposed ease in pronunciation, from a more pleasing coalescence of sounds: Thus, *embattle*, *ignoble*, *illegal*, *improper*, and *irresolute*, are used for *enbattle*, *innoble*, *inlegal*, &c.

When

When we wish to express that one person or thing *belongs* to another, it may be done, either by stating the fact, in a circumlocutary manner, or by adding *is* (or *s.* as a contraction,) to the name of the owner:—Thus, *Alexander's house* signifies the house *of*, or *belonging to* Alexander; and *God's grace*, anciently *Godis grace*, is the *grace of God*. This termination has been the subject of much discussion, and, on that account, deserves particular attention.

A Noun or thing may be in different states or situations. It may be the *agent* or the *patient*; the *possessor* or the *receiver*. In the Greek, Latin, Saxon, and German tongues, some of these situations are termed **CASES**, and are expressed by additions to the Noun instead of by separate words and phrases. Of these the English Noun has only the mark of *possession* above-mentioned, which is, therefore, called the **POSSESSIVE CASE**, and sometimes the **GENITIVE**, because of its resemblance to that case in the Greek and Latin declensions. There is, however, in modern English, a distinction in extent, if not in kind. The Latin Genitive marks the connection, in general, of one Noun with another. It denotes that the one is the *origin*, or *Genitive* of the other, from whatever circumstance it may arise. Thus *timor Dei*, the fear of God, is a *fear originating* from God. It is to God that we are to look for its *source*, but the person who is subject to the feeling is left to be discovered from

the

Of the GENITIVE is
or 's.

the other parts of the sentence ; and it is only on the ground of the attributes ascribed to the Divinity that we recognize the impossibility of its being applicable to Him. When we say “ The *fear of Cæsar* was great,” we obviously assert that Cæsar was much under the influence of *fear*. When we add, “ among his enemies,” we render the patient doubtful, it being uncertain whether his enemies or himself were subjected to the impression of dread. But, when we say, “ The *fear of Cæsar* was so great that his enemies became an easy conquest,” the passion is transferred, without ambiguity, to the hearts of his opposers.

of and off.

The signification of the particle *of* may elucidate this account of the Genitive. It is the same with the Adverb *off*, and denotes that what we speak of is *taken from*, or is a part separated from something else. It is the Saxon *af*, and does not differ from the Latin *ab*. Its primary use is *behind* opposite to *before*, and hence our *after*, as well as the phrase *fore and aft*. By a figurative manner of speech, common to all languages, *fore* and *after* are employed to denote *cause* and *consequence*; *origin* and *offspring*. Thus *from* or *frum*, (derived from *fore*,) in the Saxon, signifies *beginning*, *author*, or *source*, and, in this sense, is used by us as a preposition; while the Gothic *afar* expresses *after*, and also *posterity*. *Of*, therefore, is *sprung*, *risen*, or *made from*, and is easily assumed as synonymous with *belonging to* or *concerning*.

*Vide for
and fore.*

Though

Though two words may have different and even opposite significations, yet they may, in certain situations, be taken indiscriminately for one another. Thus, “I received money *of* him,” and “I re-
“ceived money *from* him,” have the same meaning. In the former case the money is asserted to *come from* the giver; in the latter he is mentioned as the *origin* of the gift. In the same manner, the place of the *genitive* terminations may be supplied by the word *of*, though this preposition may differ in its literal meaning from such affixes. Genitives, then, are compound words having the nature of Adjectives, and express that a thing is connected in some manner or other with the Noun to which the termination is joined. The origin of the different signs, though various, may nevertheless be expressive of the same idea, and many of our Adjectives are, evidently, the Genitives of an earlier structure of our tongue.—Those who wish to trace from probability, where certainty is denied, may compare the *is* or *'s* with the syllable *ous*, to be explained in a succeeding part of this Introduction. It will be found that “righteous men,” “men *of* right,” and “right's men,” do not materially differ; and a similar contraction of *s* from *ous* may be observed in the Adverbs *afterwards*, *backwards*, *forwards*, &c.

The Saxon genitives were, for the most part, terminated by *es* or *an*, and the latter is still added to words to form Nouns and Adjectives of a *pos-*

An.

sessive

sessive signification: as *partizan*, belonging to a party; *human*, belonging to man; *Alexandrian*, belonging to Alexander; *Egyptian*, belonging to Egypt, &c. The French use *en* separately to express the same idea, always Englished by *of* (it, him, her, or them,) and denoting that one thing is *of* or *belonging* to another. In this sense it assimilates with the affix *en* in *golden*, *silken*, &c. already explained; and on the whole, it appears that this Genitive affix was the same with the active syllable which constituted the Gothic Verbs; and, when connecting Nouns, it specified that the one *proceeded*, or was *formed*, or *made* from the other.—Words in *in* or *ine*, as *Matin*, *Alexandrine*, and *Serpentine*, and those fashionables in *ana*, as *Johnsoniana*, &c. may be traced to a similar source. The latter is the Adjective *Johnsonian* with *a*, the Latin plural, affixed, and signifies *Johnsonian things*, or *anecdotes concerning*, or *belonging to Johnson*. *Ana* is principally used in the titles of books that record the memorable sayings of persons of wit and learning, and is similar to what we term *Table-talk*.

Junction
and position
of Nouns.

In the English language the juxtaposition of Nouns is, of itself, a sufficient indication of the Genitive, or that one is connected with the other; and this has given rise to a variety of compounds. A *Shoemaker* is a maker of shoes, and a *Coachmaker*, of Coaches. A *Shipmaster* is the master of a Ship, and a *Schoolmaster* is the master of a School.—Such words have been united by degrees, and were formerly

formerly connected with a hyphen, thus *Shoe-maker*, *Coach-maker*, *Ship-master*, and *School-master*. A great many words, however, are employed in the same manner, without any mark of connection, as, *Morning Song*, *London Review*, *Edinburgh Magazine*, &c. which may all be resolved on the principles which we have adopted. The number of such compositions is every day encreasing, and appear to be limited only by the pleasure or convenience of the writer.

Every *Verb* or *action* must have its *Nominative* or Of the Ac- *agent*. It must also have an *object* on which the CUSATIVE *action* falls. Thus, in “John hit the mark,” the Noun *John* is the *agent*; *hit* the *Verb*; and *mark* the *object* of the *action*. In *Verbs* of which the *agent* and the *object* are the same, as, “He “moves,” “He talks,” “It thunders,” &c. the *object* needs not be expressed, though the French in most cases, and the English in many, conjoin a *Pronoun* in the *Accusative* form. “*Elle se prome-“n it,*” she walked, is, literally, “she walked “*herself*;” and “He moves *himself*” is not uncommon for “He moves.”

In languages which have several variations in their *Noun*, a particular termination is added when it denotes being subjected to the exertion of another. Thus *Petrus* and *Maria* are Latin *Nominatives* or *Names* for Peter and Mary. If we say “Peter “loves Mary,” it is only from the one being placed *before* and the other *after* the *Verb* *loves*, that we can

can distinguish the *lover* from the *beloved*: for were we to say “Mary loves Peter,” the two states would be exchanged. In the Latin, “*Petrus amat Mariam*,” the situation of the Nouns is of no consequence: The relation of being the *object* of the *action* is expressed by the change of the Noun *Maria* to *Mariam*; and the sentence would be equally well understood though written “*Mariam amat Petrus*.” The reciprocal phrase may be either “*Maria amat Petrum*,” or “*Petrum amat Maria*.” This change in the Noun is termed the *Accusative* case, and sometimes, especially in English Grammars, the *Objective*.

M, an Accusative termination.

Though English Nouns have retained no case, except that part of the Genitive which marks *possession* or *property*, a similarity to the Accusative is visible in Pronouns. *He* (or *that person* of whom we were speaking,) may be the *agent* of certain *actions*, but when *He* becomes the *patient*, the *result*, or *object* of these *actions*, and in every case where *he* is not the *agent*, we write *him*: as, “*He loved Mary*,” or “*Mary loved him*,” which latter sentence would be perfectly intelligible though it were written “*him Mary loved*.”

Pronouns have also the *possessive* form, but in neither of the cases are the terminations ‘s and ‘m completely regular. These, more than any other part of speech, are subjected to the corruptions produced by Custom, who, in a great degree, extends her dominion over every language. Most of

the

the irregularities, in the classifications of words which might be expected to shew an equality of form, may be explained on the principle, that the words, now so intimately connected, have sprung from different sources ; and, the *I* and *me* of the English might not have shewn such an opposition of orthography, had we been sufficiently acquainted with the origin of the *ego* and *ik* of the Latin and Teutonic tongues.

It may be further observed of Genitives, that they have, from the shifted station of our prospect, a two-fold signification. In either point of view, one Noun is understood to *belong* to another ; but, in the *one* case, we consider a Noun as the *property* of its Genitive, while, in the *other*, we consider a Noun as having a *right to*, or *power over*, that with which it is so connected. In *this* we attend more particularly to the *proprietorship*, and in *that* to the *state of subjection*. These different modes of expression have often no distinguishing mark excepting that of *Emphasis* ; which points out the word, on which we wish the meaning of the sentence principally to depend, by a more forcible tone of pronunciation. When we say, “ This is Alexander’s *house*,” we mean that the house is a *part* of the *property*, or *one* of the things *belonging* to Alexander; but when we say, “ This is *Alexander’s house*,” we state that the house belongs to *Alexander*, and *not* to another.

Of *Emphasis*
as the mark
of Cases.

It is not, however, to the *possessive* case alone that we are to refer the ambiguity which we have noticed; nor is it there that Emphasis is exclusively requisite. There is, perhaps, no phrase that may not thus have its various modifications of meaning: which, beside punctuation and the other marks of modern invention, require, for their resolution, that we should enter into the views, and catch a portion of the spirit of the writer. For example, “John struck James” shews the same *agent*, *action*, and *object*, in whatever manner it may be pronounced; and yet it may, with the change of Emphasis, make different impressions on the mind of the hearer, by fixing his attention on either of the words more strongly than on the others. “John “ struck James” shews that John was the individual who gave the stroke, when a different person might have been suspected. “John struck James” specifies the particular mode of attack: And, “John struck James” denotes that *James*, not *another*, was the person who suffered. In writing, where the ear cannot judge, and at a period prior to the use of a separate character to mark sounds of superior impression, many cases of dubiety must have occurred, had not words of a more discriminating kind been added to the phrases. It was on this account that such words as *own*, *self*, and *same*, became necessary: “Alexander’s *own* house,” contains a *double possessive*, and fixes the proprietor

in the mind of the reader ; and “ John *himself* “ struck James,” more particularly refers to John as the striker.

The apparently superfluous addition of *own*, *self*, *of Accents*. &c. might, in vocal discourse, be, in general, superseded by the accompaniments of *tone* and *gesture* ; and it was, doubtless, to preserve, in some degree, the effects of those fleeting emotions, that the *Accents* of the Ancients were invented. Accent is to words what Emphasis is to sentences. It marks the Articulation on which the attention, in imitation of the voice, is required peculiarly to rest. If our principle be just, that every word of two or more syllables is merely a combination of as many separate words, Accent and Emphasis must be the same ; and every compound with its accentuated syllable will be, evidently, a minor sentence with its emphatical word. There will then be a basis on which pronunciation may be supported, separate from what is formed by the tide of opinion : nor is this conjecture completely novel, since it coincides with the ideas of some of the most approved writers, on the Orthoepy of the English tongue *.”

“ As emphasis evidently points out the most significant word in a sentence, so, where other reasons do not forbid, the accent always dwells with greatest force on that part of the word, which, from its importance, the hearer has always the greatest occasion to observe,” &c.

WALKER.

Attention to harmony, in the succession of Accents, forms the beauty and elegance of Prose; and their distances, preserved with measured regularity, constitutes the essence of Verse. Poetry is not exclusively allied to either. It consists in “ embodying the forms of things unknown, and giving “ to airy nothing a local habitation and a name.”— But we have wandered from our road: let us return.

Double Possessives.

In the place of the word *own*, added to the Possessive case of Nouns when precision is requisite, some of the Pronouns have a double Genitive Affix. Thus, *her* and *my* are the Possessives of *she* and *I*; but *hers* and *mine* mark the owner, in a distinctive manner, as it might be done by *her own* and *my own*. In Syntax the simple Possessive is always placed before, and the double after, the Noun to which it refers. We say “ *her house*,” and “ *the house is hers*;” and it is proper to say “ *my horse*,” and “ *the horse is mine*.” *My* and *mine*, *thy* and *thine*, are, however, sometimes confounded, but their distinction is as evident as *her* and *hers*, or *your* and *yours*; and it is from their representing each two different words that the confusion has arisen. The Possessives *my*, *your*, *thy*, &c. and indeed all Genitives, may, in a certain point of view, be regarded as Adjectives. It is a *quality* of a Noun that it belongs to another. The possessive Pronouns, therefore, used as adjectives, were, in the Gothic and Saxon languages, subject to inflection; and it is the Genitives of these Adjectives

tives that we have retained, and to which we have here given the name of **DOUBLE POSSESSIVES**.

In the masculine singular, *min* and *meina* (my) were the Saxon and Gothic Genitives of *ic* and *ik* (I.). Again, *min* and *meins* were applied as Adjectives, and had the secondary Genitives *mines* and *meines*. *Thy* and *thine* have been formed in the same manner, as also *our* and *ours*, *her* and *hers*, &c. Had we had no other Genitive for *I* and *thou*, our present declension would have been regular, in all the Pronouns; and instead of *my* and *mine*, *thy* and *thine*, we should have had *mine* and *mines*, *thine* and *thines*. As the case stands it were better, on all occasions, to leave to *my* and *thy* the undisturbed possession of the simple Genitive.

We shall here give the arrangement of those simple Pronouns which have forms of declension; and, though the definitions of such words belong more properly to the body of the work, we shall serve ourselves with the facility of explanation which their joint exhibition presents.

Declension
of
Pronouns.

	Nominative	Genitive	Oblique Case
	or Agent.	or Possessive.	or Double Possessive.
Singular	<i>I</i>	<i>my</i>	<i>mine</i>
Plural	<i>We</i>	<i>our</i>	<i>ours</i>
Singular	<i>Thou</i>	<i>thy</i>	<i>thine</i>
Plural	<i>Ye or you</i>	<i>your</i>	<i>yours</i>
Sing. masc.	<i>He</i>	<i>his</i>	<i>him</i>
Sing. fem.	<i>She</i>	<i>her</i>	<i>her</i>
Sing. neut.	<i>It</i>	<i>its</i>	<i>it</i>
Plural	<i>They</i>	<i>their</i>	<i>them</i>

In these Pronouns, we easily discover, that they are each expressive of the quality of an object. *I* is the speaker, *thou* the hearer, and *he*, *she*, or *it*, is the person or thing spoken of. All denote qualities of existence; but such qualities as make different impressions on the mind. *I* is the being of consciousness, *thou* of perception, and *he* of memory. *He*, *She*, and *It* (formerly *Hit*) are equivalent to *Man*, *Woman*, and *Thing*.

Variations
in the 1st
and 2d Per-
sons.

The plural *we* and its compounds, in place of *I*, &c. are employed by Kings in addressing their subjects. The same language is also sometimes held by Orators and Authors. In the former case, a King may be supposed to represent the collective power of the Nation; and, in the latter, the Orator and Author may be conjoined, in imagination, with the

the hearer and the reader. In the second person, a similar, but more general, variation occurs:— Neither the singular *thou*, nor any of its compounds, is ever expressed in ordinary style. They belong solely to the solemn, or to the burlesque when it affects solemnity. It is the language of adoration and of Poetry, while *you*, *your*, and *yours*, are in common use. The idioms which we have here described are also common to the French and some other tongues.

When we speak of an object which is other-^{of it and} wise, or particularly, known, we prefix *the*, and say, *the man*, *the woman*, *the thing*, *the men*, &c. the Article *the* being the same in every variation of Gender or Number. *The* designates a *thing* or *action* in general, as separately marked by *he*, *she*, or *it*, while the Pronouns perform the same office in most other languages. *It* and *the*, when Gender is not attended to, are synonymous. Each is expressive of Being in general, and when used Verbally signifies to *bring forth*, or to *add* to what we already see. *The*, *it*, *and*, *add*, *at*, *to*, and *do*, are kindred words. They mark that an addition is made to some collected mass of existence. *To*, which literally signifies *add*, (like *at* and the Latin *ad*), is merely a different pronunciation of *do*. It expresses the junction of another thing, or circumstance, as appears more evidently from its varied orthography of *too*. In tracing the connection of words, through different languages, *th*, *d*, and *t*, ^{Transmigran-} ^{tion of let-} ^{ters.}

may be considered as a single letter. They are more or less forcible utterances of the same sound. This change, in the strength of the pronunciation of letters, constitutes much of the distinction between what are termed the sister tongues. The slightest attention to the powers of the organs of speech, will convince us how easily the *b*, *p*, *v*, and *f*; the *c*, *k*, *g*, and *q*; or the *c*, *s*, and *z*, may be interchanged. In the Greek, the labials, palatines, and dentals, that is, the letters pronounced by the lips, the palate, and the teeth, “were respectively “related, and frequently exchanged for each “other.” We shall have occasion to notice several similar transformations, in the different Gothic dialects, which may be accounted for on the same physical principles. For instance, many of our words beginning with *t* are, in German, begun with *a*, *z*; as *zeit* for time (tide); *zehn* for ten; *zweig* for twig, &c.

The German *Thun* signifies *to do*, and our word *thing* is simply a participle from a like Verb, and used as a Noun, in the same manner that *doing* and *action* are formed from *act* and *do*; or the Latin *factum* from *facere* to make. *Thing*, expresses a separate *act*, or an individual *substance*;—whatever can be distinguished from others. *To do* is to accumulate *things*, otherwise expressed by the word *think*, which is only applied, figuratively, to the operations of the mind. A different orthography for the literal and metaphorical meanings we shall find

find to be pretty general. The imaginary productions are termed *thoughts*, a Noun formed from the Participle of the Verb *to think*. The Saxon *Weordan* signifies *to be, to become, or to be produced or made*, being equivalent to the Latin *Fieri*. *Weorcan* is *to Work*;—it is to bring forth *things*, or cause them to *be*. The Latin *id* (our *it*) has been compounded in the same manner as *the*; and hence *idea*, which is synonymous with *thought*.

The forms a numerous class of compounds. *That* is *the it* or *the thing*, and is so separated in Saxon. *Then* is *the time*. *Thence* is from or off the time or place. It is the Genitive of *then*, and has the additional derivatives *thenceforth* and *thenceforward*. *There*, or *the place*, was formerly spelt *their*. It is primarily of the same import, being the Genitive of *the*. *Their* is now confined to express the Possessive of the plural *they*, and *there* to the situation of a single inanimate object. “I “shall go *there*”—place is here understood from the verb *go*. I go to the place of *the*, that is, to that of something before-mentioned. *Thither* is *the there*, and hardly differs from *there*. *Thitherto* and *thitherward* denote the *end* and the *direction* of our journey. The other compounds of *there*, viz. *thereabout*, *thereafter*, *thereat*, *thereby*, *therefore*, *therefrom*, *therein*, *thereinto*, *thereof*, *thereon*, *thereout*, *thereto*, *thereupon*, *thereunto*, *thereunder*, *therewith*, and *therewithal*, require no explanation farther than of the parts of their composition.

Compounds
from *the*.

Of *than* and
then.

Referring to our explanation of *en*, *then* may be considered as equivalent to the word *done*. Like Participles, it is expressive of *time*, because it states, in conjunction with the other words in the sentence, that such a thing happened *then*, or when another action was *done*, or had existed. From this idea of consequent connexion, *then* also signifies *after* in point of order or of time, and it is in this sense that it is used in comparison. The spelling, in the latter case, is *than*, but the words are the same, and were once written indifferently for each other. The syllable of comparison *er* signifies before, and metaphorically superior. *Then* or *than* is the follower, or *after* in the train of events. “Charles is taller *than* Thomas,” pronounces that Charles is before or superior, and Thomas *then*, or *after*, in tallness.

Of *this* and
that.

It seems to have been the practice of our Ancestors to express things at hand by the masculine Pronoun, and those at a distance, (as being less intimately known,) by the neuter. *That*, and its plural *those*, therefore, denote what are not immediately present; and *this* and *these*, formed from the Gothic *is*, he, mark the objects that are near. It is on this account that we have a sort of duplicate of most of the Pronouns from *the*. When the objects are at hand, or when we advert to what was last spoken of, we make use of compounds formed of the masculine *he*. *Here*, *hereabouts*, *hereafter*, *hereat*, *hereby*, *herein*, *hereinto*, *hereof*, *hereon*, *hereout*,

Compounds
from *bere*.

hereout, hereto, (heretofore,) hereunto, herewith; *hence, henceforth, and henceforward, differ from the corresponding words there, thereat, thereby, &c.* *only in consequence of the supposed distinction of situation. Here is this place, there is that place. Here is contiguity, there is distance.*

The Greek *καὶ, kai*, and the Latin and French *que*, Pronouns
in *wh.* have originated in a similar manner with our word *the*, and its verbal relatives *to* and *do*. It is thence that they are explained in the Dictionaries, of the several languages, by *and, as, then, that, than, &c.* The Romans used the prefix *que*, as we do *the*, to limit pronouns; and hence *quis, quæ, quod* or *quid*, equivalent to *who* and *what*, is compounded of *is, ea, id*—he, she, it. *Who* and *what, the he, and the it*, were formerly written *qua* and *qubat*, sounded like *wh* or *hw*, the Gothic *o* and the Greek aspirate *ī.*

The distinction between the Pronouns in *wh* and *th*, as *what* and *that*, is not in the original, but in the customary meaning. In very old English they are indiscriminately used. The Anglo-Saxons had *the* for our *who*, writing *Ic the* for I who, *thu the* for thou who, and *se the, or the the*, for he who. *Se, seo, and that*, was the Saxon Article, in the different genders, answering to our *the*, and the Greek *ὅ, ἥ, τό*.—The same words were also expressive of he, she, and it, and likewise of the relatives *who* and *which*.

Distinction
between
what and
that, &c.

We have frequently occasion to observe that, when two synonymous words are found in the language, they generally fill different departments, one assuming the natural and the other the figurative power. Pronouns in *wh* are exclusively employed when a question is asked ; and in this alone, among our older writers, consists their distinction from those in *th*. *Who* is, therefore, *the he*, with its Genitive *whose* and accusative *whom* ; and *what* is *the it*, or *that*, having the double Possessive *whereof*. *Where* is equivalent to *there*, and was formerly written *wheir*, *whair*, or *quhair*.

Though the ancient use of *what* and *that*, *where* and *there*, &c. differed only in the Interrogative Mood, yet in modern usage there is another distinction. *Who*, *which*, &c. are never applied as Articles. We say “ *that* or *this* is the man ; ” but we never say, in the same sense, “ *what* is the man.” This regulation is necessary with us to preserve the individuality of demonstrative and interrogative phrases, which might otherwise be confounded.— Pronouns in *wh* are always relatives ; those in *th* may be either Relatives or Demonstratives. In the former situation, however, they are gradually growing into disuse, being superseded by *who*, *which*, and such like.

Of Interro-
gation.

There is nothing in either of the relative Pronouns indicative of *question*. In no case do they change their nature. Whether the sentence be imperative, interrogative, or otherwise, is to be

learned

learned only from the tone of pronunciation ; from other words added, as, “ tell me,” “ I ask you,” &c. ; or, from a customary arrangement, which shews that the request is implied. In all questions, it is *the he* or *who*, *the it* or *what*, *the him* or *whom*, and the like, of which we wish to be informed ; and, it is hence that such words are so often prefixed to clauses of Interrogation. *Qui*, *quæ*, *quod*, &c. hold the same place in the Latin language, and gave birth to the Verb *Quærere* to ask, or enquire, from whence we have *Question*, *Inquisitive*, *Require*, &c. “ Is it he,” is no more the wish for information than “ It is he.” The usual form of Syntax alone recalls the idea of request, in the same manner as the hearer might judge from the sound of the voice. In a question the Verb always precedes its Nominative, contrary to the order of Assertion ; and it is in this mode of grouping the words that we recognize the interrogation. “ Tell me *what* I shall do,” and “ *What* shall I do,” have the same import. The word *what* undergoes no variation of meaning.

Different dialects of the same language are formed by the variation of the labial, palatine, and dental letters formerly mentioned. The sound or letter *b*, is another mark of distinction : it adds a breathing to the vowel or consonant to which it is joined. This aspiration was common among the Greeks, and is attached to some of the branches of the Gothic, while others prefer the harder consonants. Of the letter b.

sonants. It is on this account that we see such combinations as *ch*, *gb*, *ph*, *th*, &c. the sounds of which, when they become general in a Nation, are sometimes denoted by single letters. The German has commonly *w* or *u* for our *wh*, as, *uatt* or *was* for what; *ueit* for white, &c. In other cases the *u* is dropped and the *h* remains, as *hu* for who; *hobl* for whole; *bohr* for whore, &c. The German Orthography is extremely irregular and uncertain. Their writers follow pronunciation rather than Etymology, while the English retain letters which have long been discarded from the sound of the word. It is on this principle that *how* and *why*, so similar in sound and meaning, vary in their appearance. These words are the same with *who* or *what*, having a préposition understood. *Why* was formerly written *forwhy*, being the Saxon Accusative *forwhy* or *forwhon*, and signifies *wherefore*, or *for what* cause, reason, or thing. *How* is often supplied by the phrases, “in what manner,” or “in what degree.” The Saxon is *humeta*, from *mete*, manner, or measure. The corresponding words in other languages have a similar formation. *Quare*, *quamobrem*, and *quapropter*, are, in Latin, equivalent to *why*, and literally signify *for what thing*; and *quomodo*, *how*, is *quo modo*, in what manner. *Cur* was once *quur*, that is *quare*.

Of the letter *W*.

The *W* was formed, as its name indicates, from two *V*'s. It is not comprehended in either the Latin, French, or Italian Alphabets; and, when the

the Roman character was introduced into this country, it was printed *VV*. In different pronunciations it is changed into *u* or *v*; and, by an easy transition, from *v* into *f*. In some parts of Scotland all the Pronouns in *wh* are turned into *f*, the inhabitants, in their broad accent, using *fa*, *far*, *fan*, and *fat*, for who, where, when, and what; and *fu*, indifferently for *how* and *why*. Attention to this peculiarity may be useful in our future investigations.

From the structure of the organs of speech, it might perhaps be conjectured that the sounds *th* and *s* should naturally fall into one another, as we already observed of *t* and *z*. However this may be, we find that such a transmutation actually occurs, and particularly in the Pronouns, which are most liable to corruption. The Latin has *is*, *ea*, *id*; the Gothic *is*, *si*, *ita*; and the English *he*, *she*, *it*. The Gothic Article is *sa*, *so*, *thata*, in the different genders, corresponding to our *that*. The German *er*, *sie*, *es*, (he, she, it,) compounded into *der*, *die*, *das*, becomes *who*, or *what* and *that*. *As* and *so* are Pronouns which may, in every case, be explained by *it* or *that*; and differ only in the manner in which they are used. *So*, considered as an Adjective, is written after the Noun, or phrase, to which it alludes; *as* is followed by the word, or sentence to which it is the relative. “I will do *so*,” and “I will do *as*,” both mean “I will do *that*;” but *as* requires something to follow; for instance, “I will

“I will do *as* he bids me.” So is the succeeding state.—“He bids me do it, and I will do *so*.” *So* is employed as a relative when *as* is demonstrative: “*As* the tree falls, *so* it must lie.” In comparative sentences, *as* is both the relative and antecedent: “John is *as* brave *as* James.” These modes of usage are better learned from reading than from rules. They are completely arbitrary, for, in their original import, the words are synonymous.

Pronouns
expressive
of simili-
tude.

When one thing has the appearance of another, the first impression on the mind is, that the new object is *that*, *the it*, or *the same*, which we formerly observed. Accordingly the Pronouns are the origin of all words expressive of *likeness* or *similitude*. *Same* is from the Gothic *sa* or *so*, as, in Latin, *idem*, the same, is from *id*, it. *Identity*, from *idem*, is *sameness*; *similarity* is likeness or sameness, in a certain degree. This application of the Pronouns to express relationship, equality, or kind, is common to many, if not to all, languages. Words which are often conjoined are readily incorporated with one another; and therefore we find that most of the terminations which denote nature or kind are simple Relatives.—These will afterwards fall to be explained.

of *self*.

In treating of the double Possessive, we noticed the necessity of certain words of particularization, such as *self*, *same*, &c. which are Pronouns, and repeat the Noun. Repetition is naturally adopted, when we wish the hearer to fix his attention on a particular

particular object. *So* is, in general, used Adverbially, and states that an action is done *like* or *in the manner* described. *Thus* is *the so*. When this *manner* is left to be guessed, we are at liberty to suppose it to be improper, and suppressed from the delicacy of the speaker, who marks the word emphatically, and says, “He did it *so, so*,” or “but “*so, so*.” *Self* and *same* are synonymous, excepting that *self* is never used but in composition, or in conjunction, with other Pronouns. *Self* repeats that which we wish to dwell on with marked attention;—what we would name again were it not for the harshness of tautology. The plural is *selves*. It has always an elliptical form of construction, never being joined to a Pronoun in the Nominative case. The compounds are *myself*, *thyself*, *himself*; *ourselves*, *yourselves*, *themselves*; *herself*, and *itself*. The Saxon, however, was written *Ic self, thu self, he self, &c.*

There are many words derived from the Pronouns, as *quality*, *quantity*, *equal*, *such*, *also*, *which*, &c. Some of these we shall afterwards have occasion to discuss in the Introduction, the others will be found in the Dictionary. We shall therefore conclude this part of our investigation with a list of such compound Pronouns, not already mentioned, as require little farther illustration; but may be understood by referring to the words with which they are connected.

Derivatives
from the
Pronouns.

How	Whereas	Wherewithal
However	Whereat	Whereupon
Howsoever	Whereby	Whither, or
WHAT	Wherever	what place
Whatever	Wherefore	Whether, or
Whatsoever	Wherein	what thing
WHEN	Whereinto	Whithersoever
Whence	Wherof	Who
Whenev ^{er}	Wheresoever	Whoever
Whensoever	Whereto	Whoso
WHERE	Whereunto	Whosoever
Whereabout	Wherewith	Whomsoever

It may here be observed that *what* is sometimes taken substantively for *Thing*, and spelt *whit*. “*Aught, or ought, is a whit, or o whit, o standing for a or one. Naught, or Nought, is na whit or no whit *.*”—In Saxon it was written *noht*, contracted from *no hit*, equivalent to *no it*, or *no thing*. From this comes our word *naughty*, worthless, or of no value.

Of the termina-
tion *ee*.

Me and *thee* appear to follow an order of termination which is sometimes applied to other words, to mark their being in the *Objective* state. When *ee* is added to the name of the Verb, it forms

forms a Noun which is the *object, patient, or result* of that Verb. Thus *Assignee* is he to whom any thing is *assigned*—*trustee* is he to whom it is entrusted.

In opposition to the Objective terminations, ^{Of *er, or,* and *our.*} Nouns have, often, an affix, expressive of their being the *agent* in an action. The Celtic *er*, signifying *man*, originated the German Pronoun *er*, he, which, added to a word denoting action, specifies a reference to the *Man*,—the *he*, who acts. Thus *lover* is he who loves; *truster*, the *man* who entrusts; *baker*, the bakeman; and *weaver*, he who weaves. It is sometimes written *or*, as in *author*, *actor*, and *doctor*, anciently *authour*, *actour*, &c.; and it is occasionally used to signify the instrument, or machine, by which any work is performed; but, in this case, the lifeless actor is animated by personification.

The distinction of sexes not being commonly ^{of *ess* and *ix.*} marked in English Nouns, the same affix, *er*, is in *ix.* general employed, whether the *agent* be *male*, *female*, or *inanimate*. This is not however universal, for there is one termination expressive of the *feminine* gender. *Ess* (or *ix*, as it is sometimes written,) is probably the same with the Pronoun *she*, in like manner that *er* represents the masculine *he*; and, to those who attend to the facility with which the vowels become either initial, or terminal, or mute, in the progressive changes of language, the supposition will, by no means, appear

fanciful or extravagant. From this affix we have the following association of masculine and feminine Nouns :

<i>Abbot</i>	<i>Abbess</i>	<i>Actor</i>	<i>Actress</i>
<i>Administrator</i>	<i>Administratrix</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Authoress</i>
<i>Chanter</i>	<i>Chantress</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Countess</i>
<i>Emperor</i>	<i>Empress</i>	<i>Executor</i>	<i>Executrix</i>
<i>Lion</i>	<i>Lioness</i>	<i>Prince</i>	<i>Princess</i>

with many others, and the list is gradually increasing, as it is found, or believed, that women are capable of those employments, which were formerly deemed beyond their powers. *Ster* is the feminine affix in the Saxon and Dutch languages, and appears in the word *spinster*, and a few others ; but it is too seldom used to be regarded as a regular termination. Besides, in English, it is at times masculine, as in *maltster*, &c.

*Er, or, and
our, form
abstract
Nouns.*

The personal affix *er*, (*or, our,*) is also applied to Qualities, which are thereby raised to the dignity of imaginary personages. Like words in *head*, *ness*, *ship*, &c. they become abstract Nouns, that is, general names for the passions, feelings, or actions, which the words denote. Thus, we have *murder*, from the Saxon *morth*, death ; and, from the Latin *ardens*, burning, we have *ardor*, or *ardour*, signifying *warmness* in a figurative sense, or the general name for the *ardent* feeling. In the same manner *Eur.* the French *eur* expresses the agent of an action, and

and likewise denotes the general name of a Quality considered abstractedly. Thus, *autheur* is an author, *hauteur* haughtiness, and *douleur* sorrow. We have adopted several words with this termination, as, *grandeur*, greatness, from *grand*, great ; and *douceur*, (from *doux*, sweet,) sweetness, used figuratively to signify any thing added to soften what would be otherwise disagreeable. Besides, words *Ure*. in *ure* are evidently from the same source, as *verdure*, greenness, from the French *verd*, green ; and *tenure*, a right to a certain property *held from*, or *dependent on* another, from *tenir*, to hold. The termination *ure* was formerly written *our*, as, *tressour*, *messour*, and *plesour*, for treasure, measure, and pleasure. The Latin *or* was employed in a similar manner, either to denote an agent, or to form Nouns expressive of abstract ideas. *Amor* is love, and *amator* a lover.

We have supposed the affix *er* to be the masculine Pronoun *he*, and we before asserted that the Relatives *he*, *she*, *it*, and the Article *the*, are synonymous ; and equivalent to the auxiliary *to* or *do*. *It* was formerly *hit*, and the Dutch neuter *het*, stands equally for our *it* and *the*. The Article states the existence of that to which it is annexed, whether it be quality, action, or substance. It must, in some shape or other, be joined to every Adjective, Verb, or Noun, before the idea can be completed. It is a Definitive to the Noun, a Substantive to the Adjective, and a Nominative to the Verb.

Of the Article as a
definitive,
&c.

Green is expressive of a particular colour, such as appears on the growing herbage of the field. When we wish to consider this quality, unconnected with any other, we attempt to separate it from every known substance, and apply to it a general name, as the Neuter Pronoun *it* or *the*. We take *green* **ITSELF**, or **THE green**, as denoted by the words *greenness* and *verdure*. In the same manner every Verb must have its agent. Something must perform what the Verb represents, before the idea of energy can be conveyed. A Noun or Pronoun is added to the Verb, in all cases where the agent is known; but when we wish to look upon an action *itself*, without attending to the actor, we must follow the same rule that we did in the case of the Adjective *green*. We must say *to love*, *to hate*, *to walk*, *to run*, which is *love*, *hatred*, *walking*, and *running*, viewed in the abstract, or unconnected with the individuals who might be so employed. The fact is, the Infinitive of Verbs is merely a general name for the exertion which the word denotes, and has been treated as such by some of the best writers on Grammar. *It* or *the*, as marking existence, may be either *being*, or *action*. The same word with varied orthography has different departments. *To* is, by us, applied to Verbs; but it was the neuter Article (*the*) among the Greeks. *Do* is not descriptive of any particular mode of action. It is the production of a *thing*;—of a *the* or *it*, whatever that may be, and is hence applicable to every

every Verb. If then the syllable *er* be a definitive pronoun, it may likewise mark the circumstance of *action*, and, accordingly, as a termination, it forms the Infinitive of most of the Verbs in the French tongue, as *Parler*, to speak; *menager*, to manage, &c. The English have adopted this verbal termination in the words *to stammer*, *to flatter*, *to totter*, and many others. The *to*, though redundant, is nevertheless prefixed, conformably to general analogy. The terminations *age*, *ize*, *ish*, &c. are definitives under other forms.

Er terminating Verbs.

Before proceeding farther, it is of consequence to observe the progress of the changes, or of what is termed the corruption, of languages. The Roman *c* was taken from the Greek *ν*, (*g*,) and was always pronounced hard like *k*; as, *Kæsar* and *Kikero* for *Cæsar* and *Cicero*. In many cases, especially when followed by *t*, the *g* was changed into *c*, as *actum* for *agtum* and *lectum* for *legtum*, from *ago*, I act, and *lego*, I read. In the Infinitive, and many other parts of these and similar Verbs, we have adopted the soft *g*, agreeably to the English rule, as in *agere* and *legere*. The Greek *χ* (*ch*) was the aspirated *ν*, (*k*,) but pronounced hard, as we now do in *chord*, *chronology*, and others of Greek extraction. In general we sound *c* and *g*, (the former exactly, and the latter nearly,) like *k*, when they are placed before *a*, *o*, or *u*; and like *s* and *j*, whenever they are followed by *e*, *i*, or *y*; but to this rule we have many exceptions, and hence much

Interchange of letters with one another.

confusion has been created in the science of etymology. The Italian *c*, before *e* and *i*, is pronounced like our *ch* in the words *chess* and *chill*. The French *c* is consonant with the English, excepting that, in some cases, it has the soft sound even before *o* and *u*. The Saxon *c* and *ch* had the sound of *k*. *Circ* or *circe*, a church, was *kirk*, as is still the case in Scotland. *Ric*, *rice*, or *riche*, was pronounced *rik*. It is synonymous with our *rich*, and also signified a *region* or tract of land; for, in countries where commerce was unknown, land constituted the only *riches*. *Ricedom* denoted a kingdom, equivalent to the Latin *regnum*. *Ricsian* is to govern, like the Latin *regere* or *regnare*. We have lost a letter altogether in our pronunciation of *to reign*. In Saxon, *ric* was affixed to Nouns to mark possession, or dominion, as *Cynric*, a kingdom; and it is yet seen in the word *bishoprick*, which is the possessions of a bishop. The French *ch* is like our *sh*. *Chose*, a thing, is pronounced *shoze*, and, except in the mode of application, is not different from their *cas* and *cause*. The Saxon *cildisc*, (kildisk) originates our *childish*. The Gothic *sa*, the Saxon *se*, and the French *ce*, may all be Englished by *the* or *this*; and the gradation of their departure from the Latin *que* is evident. The soft *c* and *g* are easily converted into *s* and *z*; and we before observed the correspondence of these last-mentioned letters with *th* and *d*. Our Nouns terminating in *tion* had formerly *cion* or *cioun*. *Dis-*

The termina-
tion
rick.

cretion

cretion was *discrecioun*, and *nation* was *nacioun*. *Ancient* is yet spelt both ways. The sound is that of *sh*.

It may be further observed that Alphabets were the productions of the more learned nations. They were transferred to others where the art of writing was more recently known; and, in many cases, were but ill adapted to express the novel sounds which they were made to represent. Our *n*, when followed by *c*, *g*, *k*, *q*, or *x*, produces two different sounds, according as the following letter is softened or separated. These are observable in the words *long* and *longitude*; *angle*, and *angel*, &c. The Greeks expressed the sound of *n* by *g*, prefixed to *g*, *k*, *x*, or *ch*; as *αγγελος* *aggelos* pronounced *angelos*, an angel; *αγκαλη*, *agkalé* for *ancalee*, the bended arm. The *g*, in such cases, may have assumed the place of *n*, from a similar cause, that the *n* is sometimes changed for a duplication of the subsequent letter in the particles *in*, *con*, &c. when used in composition. The French have what is termed their nasal sound, in almost every case where either *n* or *m* is immediately followed by another consonant. Thus *dans*, *in*, *tant*, so much, and *champ*, a field, are pronounced as we should *dang*, *tang*, and *shang*; while, in some districts, the sound is so peculiarly nasal that it is treated as a vowel. *N* and *m* are interchangeable in different tongues. Their sounds, though formed by separate organs, are nearly alike. Greek Nouns in *on* are usually terminated

Adoption of
letters from
foreign Al-
phabets.

terminated in Latin by *um*. In the latter language the prepositions *cum* and *con* are the same; and *solennis*, yearly, from *solus*, alone, and *annus* a year, is likewise written *solemnis*, the origin of the word *solemnity*. *Tantum* is used for *tam tum*, and *quendam* for *quemdam*, &c. In the Galic or Erse manuscripts the sound of *v* is marked by *bh*, a sort of aspirated *b*, as *ph* or *f* is of *p*. It is also written *mb*, the utterance of the labials *m*, *b*, *v*, &c. being similar. The aspiration or *h* appears to have been added at will to every simple sound. Its addition to *c* or *g* forms, in Scotland, a harsh gutteral, unknown to the modern English. The Italians have almost totally discarded *h* from their alphabet.

Of *r*, *t*, and *l*. The letter *r*, among the Greeks, was generally aspirated, but the Romans, on the contrary, gave it so soft and lisping a sound, that in writing they sometimes omitted it, calling the *Etrusci* *Thusci*, or *Tusci*; and especially before *s*; thus *Ennius* wrote *prosus*, *rusus*, for *prorsūs*, *rursus*; The sound of this lisped *r* was so near that of its neighbour *s*, that they wrote *asa*, *casmen*, *Papysii* for *ara*, *carmen*, *Papyrii*; and we find the termination *os*, as well as *or*, in good writers still, particularly in the prince of poets, where *arbos* and *honos* frequently occur; and *labos*, *vapos*, &c. in others. The liquids are often changed reciprocally into one another, as from *puer* comes *puera*, *puellā*; and as *cælulus* was anciently written for *cæruleus*, so on the contrary we find *lati-*

aris,

"*aris* for *latialis*. In some words *r* and *n* are written indifferently, as in *æreus* or *æneus* *." From this it is probable that the Gothic and Latin *is*, the Latin *ille*, the French *il*, the German *er*, &c. all equivalent to the masculine Pronoun *he*, are of common origin.

The Vowels are mutually changed for one another. The Greek *ai* became the Latin *æ* and the terminations *os*, *e*, *on*, were transposed into *us*, *a*, *um*. In English *o* was formerly used where we now have *a*; and *vice versa*. *Hand* and *land* were written *hond* and *lond*. *Band* and *bond* are both retained. Each of our Vowels have two or more different sounds, which are reciprocally confounded in the several quarters of the Island; and so uncertain was our ancient Orthography in this respect, that, in Etymological researches, the changes of the Vowels are generally disregarded. *Y* has with us the power both of a Vowel and of a Consonant. In either case it assimilates with *i*, and in the latter with *j* or the soft *g*; while the *j*, especially in French pronunciation, is merely an aspirate of *s* or *z*. It is on this account that these letters are interchangeable among various dialects. The *g*, in the Saxon and Teutonic tongues, has, in many cases, been superseded in English by *i* or *y*; and, on the contrary, the *y* has been turned into *g*. *Gairnan*, Gothic, to desire, has become *yearn*. The Saxon *dag* signifies a *day*, and *stæger*, a stair.

Of the
Vowels.

Went

Went (goed) was formerly *yode*, and *yon* is simply the participle *gone*. The Scotch say *yard* for *garden*, *yate* for *gate*, with many other similar transformations. *T* had formerly the place of *th*, as *ye* for *the*, and *yem* for them, and *z* was written for *y*, as *zeir* for *year*.

General Connection of Language.

There is, therefore, a sort of transmigration of the sounds which constitute the languages of mankind. For a little time, and in a contracted circle, each has its peculiar utterance and tone. As they are gradually transferred to the other quarters of the world, the mode of their appearance is changed. Their identity is continued, but the Linguist, like the Pythagorean, may often toil himself in vain to discover what they have been. Occasionally, however, we may recognize an old acquaintance, whose information shall partially repay our otherwise fruitless search. By persevering industry and philosophical investigation, a comparison of languages might be instituted, and a kind of polyglot Lexicon might possibly be formed; in which could be traced, through many tongues, the identity or consanguinity of the corresponding words. But such a work would require an union of talents that fall to the lot of few; and, after all, would be particularly exposed to that species of ridicule which, so often, attaches to the labours of Etymology. Though it is not, then, for us to attempt so difficult an undertaking, yet, by keeping the principle in view, much advantage may be gained. Though we cannot

trace

trace the spirit through the varied forms which it may assume, we may catch a glimpse of the flitting shade before it vanish from our view.

We have already remarked that *to*, preceding the name of an *action*, represents its *accomplishment*, in the same manner that *the*, before the Name of a *substance*, denotes its *existence*: that the definitive Article, the demonstrative Pronoun, and the Verbal addition, are synonymous. These Particles, however, are not universally connected with the Verb, or Noun. Both may be generally expressed, and exertion, or existence, understood. We say, “Man is “born to trouble,” without alluding to any individual; and we say, “You love,” supposing the implication to be evident, that the Noun *love* is a feeling of the mind of him whom we address. The variation introduced by custom, in this respect, has produced some irregularities in the English Verb.

Conjugation of Verbs

There is another cause for the irregular orthography of Verbs. In several languages they have a different termination, as the actor is in the first, second, or third person; and this mode of writing partially prevails in the English tongue. In such cases the Pronouns corresponding with *I*, *thou*, *he*, &c. bear a particular sway, and, in the progress of time, become incorporated with the Verb. Among some Nations, the connection may be general, while, in others, it may be adopted, or retained, only in those parts where it is useful, for the sake of preventing ambiguity. The persons of English

Verbs

Verbs have only two changes of termination. The Pronoun *thou* requires *est*, (contractedly *st*,) to be added to the Verb. In the present tense we say, “Thou buildest,” or “Thou lovest,” and in the past, “Thou buildedst,” or “Thou lovedst.” The third person singular, (*he*, *she*, or *it*,) is followed by a Verb having the termination *es* or *s*, as “He builds,” or “He loves;” but this is only applicable to the present tense, for, in the past, we say “He builded, or built,” and “He loved.” These phrases may also be expressed by the auxiliary *do*, to which the *est* and *es* are added, and the name of the Verb left unchanged; as, “Thou dost love,” “Thou didst love,” “He does love,” &c. The *es* was formerly *eth*, as “He buildeth,” “He loveth,” &c. but this spelling has gradually grown into disuse,

Of Tenses.

When any action is said to be performed, it is a natural question, at what *time* it is done; whether before, or at the moment the account is given, or whether the performance is merely announced, as to happen at a future period. The learned languages have occasioned much abstruse discussion relative to the *tenses*, or *times* of Verbs. Happily ours is free from this embarrassment. When the action is finished, or supposed to be so, from its being in execution previous to the time in which it is mentioned, the mark of its existence is affixed by the terminations *ed* or *en*. *I love* is present; *I loved* is past, and may be finished or not as the other parts

of the sentence express. In either case, the Verb is rather indicative of the actions being *doing*, or *done*, than the time *when*, but indeed the ideas are undistinguishable. When *doing* it must be *present*, —when *done* it must be *past*, respecting some period alluded to; and hence *time* is, by implication, included in the signification of the Verb. *En* and *ed* are not to be distinguished, except, perhaps, in the degree of modification in which they are applied. The past tense and the past Participle are the same word, only in the former we attend to the *action*, and in the latter to its effects upon the *object*. In the first case it is most common to employ *ed*, and in the second *en*. *Ed* is applicable to both, but *en* seldom appears except in the Participle.—We say, “He *proved* the fact,” and “the “fact was *proved*,” or, “was *proven*.” They are perfect synonyms of *to* or *do*—They mark the *end* or completion of the action. *Ed* is sometimes corrupted into *t*, as *mixt* for mixed, *spilt* for spilled, &c. in which case it is usually applied to denote the Participle, and the regular formation *ed* marks the Preterite: “I *mixed* the ingredients.”—“The “ingredients were *mixt*.”

The termination *ed*, in the Participle, appears to lose its active meaning, and designates a quality, or Adjective, of the nature of the Verb. It expresses something that has been subjected to exertion, and is the result of its power. A *wounded* man is he who has suffered an *wound*. A *proven* fact is one which

Ed and *id*
terminating
Participles
and Adjec-
tives.

which has been determined by *proof*. It is a fact of a particular kind ;—one that has been demonstrated. Adjectives are formed in this manner from Nouns not generally considered as Verbal ; as, *diseased* from *disease*. In this case *id* is often written for *ed*, as in *putrid*, *morbid*, and *fervid*.—These are usually denominated Adjectives, but there is no distinction between them and the other Participles. The classes of words run into one another, and change their appearance as we shift our station.

Termina-
tion *ght*.

A number of Verbs have their Preterite and past Participle terminated in *ght*. *To bring*, *to buy*, *to think*, *to teach*, &c. have *brought*, *bought*, *thought*, *taught*, &c. when the action is *finished*, or when a *quality* is derived from it. Such words are all of Saxon origin, and were written *brohte*, *bohte*, *thohte*, &c. having a gutteral sound like the ancient pronunciation of *ght*. We may here refer to our account of *ought* and *nought*, when treating of the Pronouns. The comparison between *hit* and *ed* will be obvious. Many of our Nouns forming monosyllables in *ght* are from the same source : For instance, *thought* is a Verb in the Preter tense, as well as a Noun expressive of the principle of *thinking*.

Of Moods.

In the Latin, and some other languages, there is also a variation in the Verb, as the *modes* of action differ ;—as the speaker commands or entreats ;—as it is asserted with certainty or with hesitation. Moods in

in English are indistinctly marked, and must, in many cases, be gathered from the studied meaning of the sentence. We already noticed a difference of arrangement in the Interrogative, but other moods, (as the Imperative) have a similar phraseology. In vocal discourse the tone and gesture are sufficient indications, but, in writing, the reader is often much indebted to punctuation. There is, indeed, one form of orthography which is a kin to the Subjunctive mood of the Latin tongue. This consists in cutting off the *est* and *es* from the second and third person whenever the action is *conditional*. Thus we say *thou lovest*, but in expressing a doubtful case we say, *if he love*; and instead of *he loves*, we write *if he love*. The first, or undoubted, mode of expression, has been termed the Indicative, and the other the Subjunctive, or Conditional Mood. This Subjunctive has created considerable difficulty to teachers of English Grammar, while the practice has been neglected and confounded with the Indicative, by the greater part of our best writers. The words *to have*, *to be*, *to will*, &c. which are used to express the modifications of other Verbs, have an irregularity of structure and usage, in this respect as well as in others, which preclude them from the general rules of formation. These, along with what are defective or anomalous, will be exhibited, in their various states, in the order of their explanation.—For such as are regularly formed, (having the termination *ed* to distinguish the *past* from the *present*,)

present,) the following Rule is universal: In every expression which positively asserts an action to be doing, or done, without any supposition or reserve, and, in all questions of an action's being so performed, EST, (when the pronoun THOU is used,) is added to the second person, both past and present, and ES, or ETH; to the third, of the present tense, in the singular of the Verb. In every other mood the Name of the Verb is written without the slightest alteration.

Source of
the termin-
ations of
Adjectives:

Adjectives express the quality of substances, but these qualities must be denoted by terms of similitude or agreement. The names of these qualities are Nouns; and it is only when we apply them to other Nouns, so as to modify or determine their kind, that they are properly termed Adjectives. The Noun whose quality we mention, is then stated, in some way or other, *to belong to, to be like, or to be of the nature* of something else from which the Adjective is derived. In their formation different modes have been followed. Names have been conjoined, leaving the connection to be implied, as in *Goldsmith* and *Shipmaster*; or, the one has acquired an affix expressive of power, or origin, as exemplified in our remarks on the Genitive.—One may be the *result* of the action of another, like the *past* (or the *agent* like the *present,) Participle of Verbs*; or, by the addition of an Article, or Pronoun, one thing may be stated to be *the same, the it, or, the like* of that with which it is connected. From what we have already remarked upon the structure

structure of words, we shall more seldom have occasion, in our further account of the terminations, to trace them minutely to their source. The origin of many will be evident from the slightest observation.

In several languages Adjectives have regular declensions, and agree with their Substantives in Gender, in Number, and in Case. In English they have only that change which is denominated Comparison. The word *er*, among the Saxons, like our *ere*, signified *before*. From the respect paid to precedence, it was also used to denote *superior in quality* as well as *prior in time*; and for that purpose was added to words of quality, to mark a superiority to what the word previously expressed: Thus, *wiser* is a greater degree of WISDOM.

When three objects are compared together, with respect to any quality possessed in common, the lowest is specified by the name of the quality, and is said to be in the Positive degree; the next is termed the Comparative degree, denoted by the addition of *er*, as above-mentioned; and the highest, or most eminent in quality, is termed the Superlative, which is marked by the syllable *est*: As, Tom is *tall*, Bob is *taller*, and Will is *tallest*. The Saxon *Erst* or *Erest*, which is still used in English, signified the highest degree of priority. Like abstract Nouns, it is probably formed from *ere*, by the addition of a definitive. This is the French

mode of comparison. *Plus* is more, and *le plus*, *the more*, or greatest, which are placed before other Adjectives, in the same manner as our *more* and *most*. *More* and *most* are the Comparative and Superlative of the Saxon *ma*, *mo*, or *mowe*, a heap. *Much* is a large quantity, *like* a heap, as will appear from our account of the termination *ch*. When Adjectives have more than one syllable they are better compared by *more* and *most*;—*more proper* and *most proper*, rather than *properer* and *properest*. *Most* is sometimes a Superlative termination, as *topmost*, *uppermost*, *southmost*, &c. Adjectives are often irregular in their comparison, as *good*, *better*, *best*; *bad*, *worse*, *worst*, &c. This may be on account of a synonymous word occupying the place of the Adjective in one of its degrees, and from the elision of letters produced by contraction. We shall notice these deviations as they occur in the course of explanation.—The comparison of Saxon Adjectives presents a curious specimen of the unsettled state of the orthography of former times. The Comparative degree was formed by *ar*, *ær*, *er*, *ere*, *ir*, *or*, *ur* or *yr*; and the Superlative by *ast*, *aest*, *est*, *ist*, *ost*, *ust* or *yst*.

Termination *most*.

Of *ent* or
ant, *ence*, or
ance, and
end.

The Latin *ens* (equivalent to the Greek $\tau\delta\sigma\tau\delta$,) signifies *being*;—*the it*, or *thing*, which exists. Hence it was used to form the present Participle in that language, as *docens* and *amans*, which express *existing*, or *being*, in the state of a teacher or a lover. Our words in *ent*, or *ant*, and *ence*, or *ance*, are from

from this source. Both denote *being*, or *state*; the former being applied to constitute Adjectives and the latter Substantives. Thus *abundant* is the *quality* of existing in *abundance*, which is the *name* given to such a state of existence. The Romans expressed the Noun by the addition of *antia*, as *abundantia*, &c. which we shall again notice under the termination *ice*. The present Participle, in Saxon, was formed by *ande*, *ende*, or *onde*; and, by cutting off the final *e*, it acquired a Substantive signification, and extended the idea to the agent: as, *alysende*, freeing, and *alysend*, a redeemer; *freonde*, loving or friendly, and *freond*, a lover or a friend. From this comes our affix *end*, for many of our Nouns with that termination were originally Saxon Participles. *Friend* and *fiend* literally denote *a lover* and *an enemy*, from *freon* to love, and *feon* to hate; and thus, having *synonymes* in the language, they are retained for the purpose of marking a peculiar variety in *love*, and in *hatred*.

Present Participles are formed by the addition of *ing* in English, and *ung* in German, both equivalent to the Latin *ens* and the Saxon *ende*. Words with this affix are rather improperly said to be in the present tense. They may be either past or present; for they express solely the existence of the quality or action. *Loving*, *hating*, *destroying*, &c. are unfinished actions. They may be now, or they may have been long ago. The name of the state itself, when considered as a Noun and not as a quality,

is expressed by *io* in Latin, by *ung* in Saxon and German, by *ing* in Low Dutch, and by *ion* in English. The syllables *ing* and *ion* are therefore the same, and indeed they are often used for one another. *Hearing* and *learning* are Nouns as well as Verbal Adjectives. "During the *action*," and "during the *acting*," are synonymous phrases.

Of *ment* and
many.

The termination *ment* has the same signification with *ion*, and forms Nouns which are in the state marked by the connected Verb. Thus, *actment*, were there such a word, would be synonymous with *action*, and either would denote the name given to any change which is produced in the universe; being equivalent, both in origin and power, to our word *doing*. *Act* is the Verb—It is the name of the mode by which such a change is effected. The words *act* and *action* have, however, been so commonly confounded, and the ideas themselves are of so general a kind, that it is difficult to mark their distinction in an accurate and obvious manner. Another Verb may tend to elucidate the subject. *Joy* is that elevation of the mind which is the consequence of pleasing sensations. *To enjoy* is to act so as to procure that rapturous feeling; and *enjoyment* is the name of such a state or action. These terminations sometimes signify the effect, or *result*, as well as the exertion itself. Thus, *portion* is the division apportioned, *raiment* is the clothes in which one is arrayed, and *judgment* is the doom pronounced. Such figures in language are exceedingly common.

Words

enjoy does not imply an act, but the result, or

Words in *ent* are often used to denominate the *agent* as well as the *quality* of the action. *Opponent*, originally an *Adjective*, is now a *Substantive*, as was formerly mentioned. Latin words in *monia* are Englished by *mony*, of the same signification as *ment*. Thus we have *alimony*, equivalent to *aliment*, or *nutriment*; and *sanctimony* might be equally well expressed by the word *sanctiment*, denoting holiness, or the state of being holy.

It may be objected, that the explanations which we give, in many cases, run into one another; and that, in several instances, the distinctions are not sufficiently apparent. The truth is, that, though the terminations were originally different in their meaning, yet, like objects seen from a distance, they would often appear to be similar. Words otherwise distinct, from a particular point of view, seem to be synonymous. *To free* and *to redeem* may in general be used indiscriminately; because, when speaking of the deliverance, it will not be always necessary to advert to the price of the freedom. But, often, the affixes differ only in appearance. They are words (generally Articles,) with a varied orthography; or, they have the same power, but originate from a different stem. What follows will sufficiently illustrate these observations:—

The Latin termination *ilis* originates our *ile*, ^{of *il*, *at*, and *er*.} *which*, added to a *Noun*, or *Verb*, forms an *Adjective* expressive of the *quality*, or *disposition*, denoted

noted by the word to which it is joined. Thus, we have *servile* and *docile*, the former descriptive of a slavish, and the latter of a teachable disposition, from the Latin *servus*, a servant, or slave, and *deceo*, I teach ; and from *hostes*, an enemy, we have *hostile*, possessing the disposition of a foe. Indeed, most of the words of this termination are Adjectives derived from the Latin, with little or no variation. Some of them have discarded the *i*, as *noble*, from *nobilis*, and *probable* from *probabilis*. The Latin *alis* and *ilis* seem to be merely different forms of orthography, but with us *al* is more generally affixed to Nouns, and is almost equivalent to the Possessive case. Thus *royal*, from the French *roy*, is belonging to a king. *Regal* is a synonyme from the Latin *rex*. *Martial*, from *Mars*, is belonging to war, and *moral* is from the Latin *mores*, manners. When a Noun ends in *l*, the addition *al* would form a disagreeable monotony, and is accordingly changed into *ar*, as *particular*, *regular*, *similar*, &c. This is also sometimes the case when ending with other letters, as *lunar*, *polar*, &c. When *al* terminates a Verb it has exactly the same meaning with *ing* or *ion*, and, at some past period, may have been a regular mark of the Participle. *Dismissal* is the same with *dismissing*, or *dismission*, and *revival* is the action of review.

Of *able*, or
ible.

From the termination *ilis*, and *habere*, to have, is formed the Latin *habilis* and our *hable*, which

signify

signify *having*, or possessing any quality which may be requisite. This, by contraction, has originated the Adjective *able*, *having* the power, or quality, necessary for any specific purpose. In the same sense of power, or ability, it is used as a termination. *Sufferable*, is having the quality of enduring or of being endured, and *durable* expresses the power of continuing to exist. It is sometimes spelt *ible*, as, *risible*, *perfectible*, &c.

In treating of Pronouns we noticed the gradation of their changes among different Nations, as the Latin *ille*, the French *il*, and the German *er*, which apply to the Adjective terminations last mentioned.

Terminations in *g, k.*

We particularly marked the Greek *τοι* and the Latin *que*, through their several gradations; and we find them again in the formation of Adjectives. Almost all known languages have a similar affix, added to Nouns, to express being of the like quality or kind. The Greek *ichos*, the Latin *icus*, the French *ique*, the German and Saxon *ig*, *isch*, and *isc*, and the English *ic*, *ick*, *ich*, and *ish*, have all the same signification; and denote that the thing to which such an Adjective is applied is of that kind, tribe, or division of things, which the Noun denominates.—

Both the Tartars and Indians, when they mean to speak of a people as to their tribe, or nation, compound their name with the word *ach*, *ack*, *acha*, or *aga*, or such sounds varied by European pronunciation, as *Cossacks*, *Calmucks*,

“*Crossaqui, Permiki, &c. Ach*, in Welch and “*Irish*, signifies tribe, race, or people *.”

The orthography of this termination is various in the English language. *Rustic*, from the Latin *rus*, the country, or fields without the city, denotes of the country kind, or belonging to those who inhabit the country. *Politic* is belonging to *polity*, or government, from the Greek *πόλις*, *polis*, a city, which was the general extent of the governments of Greece. The termination *ic* also forms Nouns, and particularly the Names appropriated to Arts and Sciences, as *Arithmetic, Logic, &c.* Formerly a *k* was added, as, *rustick, politick, Arithmetick, &c.* but this is now in disuse. The French spelling *ique* was also common about a century ago, and we still retain some words in *ique* and *esque*, immediately derived from that language, such as *antique, picturesque, grotesque, &c.* The addition *ical*, is *at* and *ic*. When words in *ic* are used Substantively, as *Politics* or *Arithmetic*, the Adjective is *Political, Arithmetical, &c.*

The soft sound of this termination forms our *ish* and *ich*, as, in *Scottish, or Scotch, Irish, Welch, boorish, &c.* The *ch* is compounded with *who* and *so* in the Pronouns *which* and *such*, which signify *who kind* and *so kind*; *who it*, and *so it*. *So great, is that great; such greatness, is that kind of greatness. Which is who, or what, of the class, or tribe,*

* *Pownal.*

*Ic, ick, or
ique, esque,
and iat.*

tribe, and was anciently *whilk*, or *qubilk*. *Ilk* in Saxon signifies *the same*. It is the Latin *idem*, and probably from *illic*, an old synonyme of *ille*. There is a verbal contradiction in our expressions of similitude. A thing may be of the same kind with another, but cannot be *the it* or *the same*; in such a case, only *one* thing could exist,—there could be no comparison. Our *like* is the Saxon *ilk*, with more propriety of usage. The latter is *same*, and the former *similar*. *Which* has the compounds *whichever* and *whichsoever*.

By the common transposition of *g* into *y*, the Saxon *myrig*, *dreorig*, &c. have become *merry*, *dreary*, &c. and express the quality belonging to *mirth*, *solitude*, or any thing else to which the affix may be applied. It is a different spelling of *ic*, *ich*, or *ish*. *Watery* is synonymous with *waterish*, and *every* was formerly *everich*. *Any* is *one* of the number, from *an*, *one*, and, being limited, may be whatever *one* we please. *Each* is *one* of the collection; but it is not *any* one, but *every* one. It is equivalent to the Saxon *elk*, and the Scotch *ilk*, and does not differ from *ilk*, as above-explained, signifying *the same* or *alike*. Names of Sciences are also, in some cases, terminated by *y*, as in others by *ic*. The Romans had *ia* and the old English *ie*. *Geometria* in Latin was formerly with us *Geometrie*, and now *Geometry*. All words in *ig* were written with *ie* before they assumed the *y*; and

and it is hence that they form their plurals in *ies*, as *valley, vallies, worthy, worthies, &c.*

Of *ly, like,*
and *ably.*

From the same change of consonants, the ancient affix *lig, lik*, or *lick*, signifying *like*, has been softened into *ly*; which, when added to Adjectives, forms Adverbs expressive of something's being done *like* what the Adjective denotes. Thus, *wisely* is *wiselike*; *foolishly* is *foolishlike*, and so of others. *Ly* added to Substantives forms Adjectives of similarity, as *Godly, lovely, and manly*: This last is also spelt with *like*, as *manlike*; and we have *warlike* and several others with the same termination. *Ably* is compounded of *able* and *ly*, and has the power of *able-like*, in *capably, creditably, probably, &c.*

Of *ary, ery,*
and *ory.*

The affix *ary* (sometimes *ery* and *ory*,) was once *arig*, and is formed by adding *ig*, expressive of sort or kind, to Adjectives in *ar, er, and or*. Thus *lunar* is belonging to the moon, from the Latin *luna*; and *lunary* is of the *lunar* kind.. These Adjectives are also used as Nouns. When Adjectives are considered Substantively, they have often a general, or collective signification, as *righteous*, is having a *right* manner or conduct, but *the righteous* includes the whole collection of *righteous* persons; because the Adjective is left indefinite, not being followed by a Noun. This collective signification is particularly obvious in Adjectives in *y* and *ary*, from the import of *ig* or *ic*. *The merry* are all the *merry*

merry people.—The *auditory* is the *audience* or collection of hearers. It is by an easy transition, that, what expresses the whole aggregate of things should also denominate the *place* where they are to be found. It is hence that *auditory* is, likewise, used for the house where the hearers are collected. *Granary* is a magazine of *grain*; *dictionary* a book of *words*; *brewery*, the houses where the trade of *brewing* is carried on; and *coopery* is the working shops of a *cooper*. In thus denoting the place occupied by a manufacture, a *collection* of workmen is always supposed; and, accordingly, we do not find that such designations are well applied to the house of a solitary artizan.

To be of the nature or kind of another admits of of diminu-
tives in itb. degree. *Sweetish* and *waterish* express, of the nature of *sweet* and of *water*, but the extent of the *water*, or *sweetness*, is indefinite. It may be of the *sweet kind*, however slight the connection. Hence many such terminations have the force of diminutives, and thus *sweetish* and *waterish* denote the possession of these qualities in a small degree. In like manner *y* is a diminutive in the Scotch dialect. *Manny* is a *little man*, and *housey* a *little house*.

Beside the partial use of *ish* above-mentioned, we have some other diminutive terminations. The Latin *ulus* and *ulus* originate our *ule*, *ulous*, and *cle*, forming words that have littleness in their nature. Thus, we have *particle*, a small part; *article*, a little joint; *module*, *schedule*, *postule*, and others.

Ule, *ulous*,
cle, and *in cle*.

Ulous

Vide *ous*.

Ulous is *ous* added to the diminutive *ule*, as in *scro-phulous*, *tremulous*, *ridiculous*, &c. The Latin *culus* in some words took the form of *unculus*, as *homunculus*, a little man; and the Saxons had the diminutive *incle*, from which a few of our words are derived.

Kin, kind,
ling, and
let.

From the German *kind*, a child, is formed the diminutive termination *kin*, as *lambkin*, a young lamb; *bodkin*, a small *body*, &c.; and those in *ock*, by corruption, as *hillock* from *hillikin*. *Kin*, *kind*, and *kindred*, are derived from the same source. They signify, of the same *family*—*children* of the same parents. *Kindlich*, the German etymon of our *kindly*, denotes *filial* affection. *Kin*, or *kind*, is merely a northern pronunciation of the Greek *γένος* and the Latin *genus*. The German *klein*, little, or small, and the Saxon *hlæne*, or *læne*, lean, or slender, allude to the state of a child. *Ling* as a termination is either a diminutive, as *little*, or descriptive of family, as *kind*. Hence we have *darling*, or *dearling*, *firstling*, *foundling*, *gosling*, &c. Some of these have a caressive signification, by recalling to our minds the simplicity of childhood. If, however, we look at this state from another point of view, it will present an object with no will of its own, but completely under the power of another. The affix *ling* is, therefore, often expressive of contempt, as applied to slavish dispositions and situations, such as *worldling*, *hireling*, &c. This allusion is common to every language, and *worldling* is

not

not a more peculiar idiom than “children of the “world.” *Let* for *little* is also a diminutive termination in the words *circlet*, *hamlet*, *streamlet*, &c.

The Italians have *ino*, *etto*, *ello*, for diminutive affixes of the masculine gender, and *ina*, *etta*, *ella*, for the feminine, which include the ideas of kindness and tenderness, associated with smallness of size. A few of these have been transplanted into this country; for instance, from *dama*, a lady, is formed *damigella*, a young or pretty lady; the French *madamoiselle*, and our *damsel*. The *ello* and *ella* are evidently compounded from the Pronouns *lo* and *la*, he and she. The others appear to be corrupted from *inlo*, *inla*, *etlo*, and *etla*, and consequently *in*, *et*, and *el*, are the Italian diminutives. *Ine* is adopted in *bulletine* and a few other words. *Et* is more common, as, *bullet* from ball,—*floweret* from flower, &c. The French have *ette*, which, as in the word *etiquette*, is in some cases transferred into our language without change.

Certain additions, indicative of bulk, or quantity, have been termed augmentatives. The Italian termination *one*, signifying large or great, is the origin of our *oon*, which is found in words derived from that language. Thus, from *sala*, a parlour, we have *saloon*, a large parlour; from *ball*, *balloon*; from *pont*, (a bridge,) *pontoon*, &c.

The Latin Article *us*, applied to Adjectives, becomes a definitive of quality, expressing the *kind*, or *manner*, of the root to which it is annexed. In

*El, et, ette,
and ino.*

*Of augmen-
tatives in
oon.*

*Of *ous*, *wise*,
and *ways*.*

English it is rendered *ous*, as in *captious*, *dextrous*, &c. The Article, like the Substantive Verb, expresses *existence*; and, when added to a word, denotes an existence such as that word describes. From the Saxon *wisan*, to be, was formed *wise*, signifying *manner* of being or acting, and mode, or manner in general. *W* is interchangeable with *g*, as *ward* with *guard*, *guile* with *wile*, &c.; and *wise* is equivalent to *guise*, which indicates manner in general, and particularly in dress or appearance. *Wise* now seldom appears, except in composition, but in old writings it was generally used. “The birth of Jesus Christ was on this *wise*,” states the *manner* of the birth of Christ. As an affix we have *otherwise*, in another manner; *likewise* in like manner, &c. Words now terminating in *ous* were formerly written with *wise*, as *rightwise* for righteous. Between *eous* and *wise* there is no distinction:—So and *ous* are synonymous. The Noun *ways* is also an affix, and differs from *wise* as the plural from the singular. *Always* was formerly *allgates*.

Adverbs
in *s.*

Until of late a distinction was made between certain Adjectives and Adverbs by the affix *s.* Thus *backward* was the *quality* of a Noun, and *backwards* the *manner* of an action. *Afterward* and *afterwards*, *forward* and *forwards*, &c. were formed in the same manner; and the modern practice of dropping the *s* seems to have been adopted without a sufficient reason, from not attending to its signification.

fication, which is equivalent to *ous*, or *wise*, as above explained. Such a corruption might naturally have happened; for, *backwardous* has a great tendency, in the pronunciation, to contract its final syllable; and *backwardwise*, or in a *backward manner*, is evidently its explanation. The place of this, and some other Adjectives of the same class, is supplied by the termination *ly*, as *backwardly*, *forwardly*, &c. but in others, such as *afterwards*, where the *ly* cannot be so easily applied, we seem, by discarding the *s*, to lose a vocable.

The Adjective *some* and the Noun *sum* have the same signification, and both were formerly written alike, *sum*. The meaning is *quantity* in opposition to *none*, from the Article *so*, as *quantity* is from the Latin. *Sum* is the amount of things added together;—*some* is a quantity without adverting to any specific number. *Some* is used as an affix, to denote that what is expressed by the conjoined word exists in a certain degree, or to a certain extent: Thus, *wearisome* implies a degree of *weariness*, in opposition to *unwearying*; and *burthensome* is a quantity of weight. That *sum*, or *some*, literally signifies *quantity*, may be illustrated from a mode of writing once very common. “He went *some* twenty miles.” “He gave him *some* twelve pounds,” &c. If, in these phrases, the word *quantity* be substituted for *some*, or even if the spelling be altered to *sum*, the meaning of either will be apparent. When *some* is applied to magnitude,

tude, it may be great or small; when applied to number, it may be one or many. *Nothing* and *something* are directly the reverse of one another, and *existence of any kind* is sufficient to mark the contrast. Like to this is the Latin Verb *sum*, I am, or I exist, that is, I have a substance or standing. *Summum* was the *amount* or quantity of existence; and, figuratively, the top, or height, of any thing, like our word *summit*.

Full or *ful.*

Full, the past Participle of the Verb *to fill*, signifies that state of a vessel when it can contain no more; and it is figuratively applied to the mind, or any mode of existence, to state that it is saturated, or completely *filled* with what we mention. When affixed to Nouns it forms Adjectives, denoting *fullness* of what the Noun specifies; and, in this use, it is now spelt with only one *l*, though it formerly had two. Thus *bountiful*, is *full* of bounty, *merciful* is *full* of mercy, and so of others.

Less.

From the Anglo-Saxon *lesan*, to dismiss, comes our *to lessen*, to make *less* or diminish. *Less* is an Adjective signifying that a part is *dismissed*, or put away, from the original mass. Instead of comparing it with what it was in its original state, it is sometimes appreciated with respect to things of a similar kind. Thus we say, “*This is less* than *that*,” figuratively asserting, that *this* must have been *lessened* so as to prevent its being equal to *that*. *Less* is therefore the same with *want*. It has been applied to Nouns to form Adjectives expressing

expressing the *want* or dismissal of what the Noun signifies. *Motionless* is the *want* of motion, and *deathless* is the *dismissal*, or the quality of not being subject to death.

When speaking of an action's being performed, in a general sense, whoever may be the agent, different nations have different phraseologies. The English say “*a person*, or *a man*, may do this or “*that*,” or “*somebody* has done it.” The Germans use the word *man*, as the general agent, and the French *on*, which is a different spelling of *un*, one. Of late we have adopted the Gallic idiom, and instead of *a person*, or *a man*, we say “*one* “*may do so*;” “*one* cannot help being angry “*when one* is used ill,” &c. *One* is here in place of a Substantive, and may be resolved by supplying the word *man*; or *person*, which is understood. It is this substitution or suppression of the Noun, that has led some French Etymologists to derive *on* from *l'homme*, a man; and it has cost them no little pains to trace the progress of the supposed corruption.—In old French *l'homme* was written where the Pronoun, or numeral, *on* is now used. *On* is also a termination, as in the words *matron*, from the Latin *mater*, a mother; *patron* from *pater*, a father, &c. It is here a Pronoun, or Article, and is similar to *er* and *an*, in *lover*, *partizan*, &c. as already explained.

Those definitive terminations which mark the Adjective when quality is attended to, are the

Of the nu-
meral and
termination
on.

Of age as
synony-
mous with
ist.

signs of Verbs when we allude to action. From the Latin *agere* to act, we have formed the termination *age*, as *marriage*, from the French *mari*, a husband, is the *act* of marrying; *carriage* is the *act* of carrying, &c. Our Verbs terminating in *ish*, as, *publish*, *punish*, and others, are from the same source; *ish* being the softened pronunciation of *age*. The signification of these affixes is, by metaphor, extended to the collected *effect*, or *result*, as well as to the *act* itself. *Verbage* is the mass of words; *foliage* is the collection of leaves; and *rubbish* is the consequence of trituration.

Of *age* as a period of time.

Age, from expressing *action*, has also come to denote the *space of time* during which any action is performed. Thus, we say, “the *age* of man,” “the *age* of the world,” “the iron *age*,” &c. to denote certain periods of existence. “He is thirty years of *age*,” states that he has lived, existed, or *acted* through the course of thirty years. *Act* and *age* are of like origin, and are compared by Shakespeare, in his “seven *ages* of human life,” with singular propriety. In this sense we have *age*, as a termination, in *nonage*, *pupilage*, &c.

Age signifies price.

Labour is generally mercenary, and, on that account, the affix *age* (money, price, or some equivalent word being understood,) expresses the value, or sum paid for the work. Thus we have *pontage*, the toll on a bridge; *wharfage*, wharf money, or wharfage money; *porterage*, porter's fees; *postage*, the price of post letters, &c. It is thus also that

many

many words in *age* have twofold significations. *Cooperage* is either the work or the value; and *carriage* is both the removal of the goods and the payment of the carrier.

Many of our monosyllables in *ch*, *ge*, *k*, and *ke*, <sup>Of *ch*, *ge*,
ke, *y*, and
ow.</sup> are varied and contracted from *age*. Thus *to stretch* is to act or make strait; *breach* is breakage; *to catch* is to seize as a cat; *to match* is to mate together; and *range* is rank, or rankage. German Particles, of the past tense, begin with *ge*, where ours end with *ed*, as *lehren*, to teach, and *gelehrt*, taught; while the Saxon *ge* was prefixed to all the parts of Verbs with the power of *con*, together, or the figurative meaning of *with*, signifying *be*, as afterwards to be noticed. We had formerly the prefix *y* in place of the German and Saxon *ge*, and a few of its compounds have been retained, such as *yceleped* from the old word *clepe*, to call, and *yclad*, a form of the past Participle of the Verb to clothe. Some of our double Consonants, as *gl*, *gn*, *kn*, &c. are from this source. The elision of the Vowel is natural, and the comparison of such words with their primitives would illustrate the assertion. *Knot* and *nut* are of similar import; and *know* is akin to the Latin *nosco*, which was anciently *gnosco*. The *g*, *y*, and *w*, being interchangeable in the northern tongues, we have the termination *ow* where the Germans, Danes, &c. have *ig* or *ige*. These languages have *morgen*, for *morrow*; *sorg*, or *sorge*, for *sorrow*; *talig* for *tallow*, &c. Their termina-

tion *ig*, marking Adjectives of kind, is transformed in English into *ic*, *y*, or *ow*. The Danish *guld*, is gold, and *guul*, is yellow or gold-like; *hellig* is holy, and the Verb *hellige*, to hallow, or make holy; *ploug* is a plough; *nage* to gnaw, &c.

Of *ise*, or
ize, *ism*, *ist*,
and *ite*.

Verbs are also constituted by the termination *ise* or *ize*, as, *to methodize*, to put into method, or regular form; *to recognize*, to know again, or acknowledge; *to subsidize*, to engage by a subsidy; *to tyrannize*, to play the tyrant, &c. where either *ise* or *ize* is written at pleasure. These Verbs, like those in *age*, are supposed to produce collections of effects, or to form classes of action, which are expressed by *ism*; as, *methodism* and *mechanism*, which denote the sect, and the production, of the *methodist*, and the *mechanist*, or *mechanic*. The affix *ism* is analogous to *y*, as applied to the names of the arts and sciences. *Botany* would be perfectly signified by the word *botanism*. The Verb and agent are *botanize* and *botanist*. The addition *ite* is synonymous with *ist*. Both denote one belonging to the class or collection which the word designates. *Favorite* is one of the favoured; and *Jacobite* was a name formerly given to the adherents of James the seventh, or of the Stewart family in general. The original and common use of *ite* was to denominate a person of a particular tribe or nation, many examples of which may be found in the historical part of the translation of the Bible: as, the *Gibeonites*, the *Hittites*, the *Jebusites*, &c.

Though

Though *ive*, like the Latin *ivus*, is a termination of *ive* and of an active nature, it is only used to form Adjectives. These express the quality of producing what the word implies, and may always be explained by the words *causing*, or *producing*. Thus, *plaintive* is *producing* plaints, or *causing* to be mournful; *incentive*, is a stimulus, or *cause* of action; *destructive*, is *causing* destruction, and so of others. On the same principle are formed our Substantives in *iff*, as *plaintiff*, he who *causes*, or originates the complaint.

The affix *ate* is a variation of *act*, and is compounded with several other terminations, forming *ated*, *acted*; *ating*, *acting*; *ation*, *action*; *ator*, *actor*; and *atory*, *actory*. The meaning of these additions is obvious: *Multiplication*, is the *action* of multiplying; *insinuator*, is *he who acts* in an *insinuating* manner, and so of others. The Latin *atio*, the synonyme of our *ation*, is sometimes Englished by *ace*; and from thence we have *solace*, &c.

From the reciprocal transmutation of *l* and *r*, *el* or *er*, or *le*, is expressive of the *agent* of an action, and also forms a verbal termination, in the same manner as *er* which we formerly explained. Its most general use is to denote an *instrument*;—an inanimate, or secondary, *agent*. The *arm*, being the part of the human frame by which any work is generally performed, has, in many languages, been figuratively used to denote the instrument by which any thing is done. Thus we speak of the *arm* of

Of *ate*, *ated*,
ating, *ation*,
ator, *atory*,
and *ace*.

power, and of the secular *árm*. *El*, in the Gothic dialects, had most probably been once synonymous with *arm*: We have preserved it in *ell*, a measure of an *arm's* length, and in *elbow*, the *bow* of the *arm*: This affix, as marking the instrument, is very common, as in *shovel*, from *to shove*; *chissel*, from *to chase*, or *en-chase*; and *needle*, from the Dutch *naad*, a seam. Many of our monosyllables, as *flail*, *nail*, &c. will be found of similar formation. In comparing Nouns in *er* with those in *el*, or the *agent* with the *instrument*, a striking resemblance is observed. Thus, *poker* is either the *person*, or the *thing which pokes*. In the former case it is an *agent*, and in the latter an *instrument*. It is from our practice of personification that this partial confusion arises. We are, perpetually, raising *qualities* to the rank of *substances*, and *instruments* to that of *agents*, while they are *qualities* alone, and not *substances*, with which we are conversant; and, while we are uncertain that an *agent*, in its literal sense, as distinguished from an *instrument*, exists in the world.

Of frequentatives in *el*, &c.

Words in *el* are, occasionally, changed into Verbs, but this transposition, as we have elsewhere observed, is common to all Nouns: for, the Verb is merely *to act* what the Noun describes. This termination, however, is itself indicative of action, and, therefore, Verbs so formed have often a frequentative signification. Thus *to prate* is to talk lightly and uselessly like a child; and *to prattle*, is

to prate much, as if we should say, to continue prating. To beat may be a single stroke; to batter and to battle, each suppose a succession of exertions. The idea of continued, or successive action, resides in the force of the Verb, rather than in the termination. All words with affixes of an active kind have this frequentative meaning, when used as Verbs, and when their nature admits of such a supposition. Thus *to jactitate*, is to toss about; and *to agitate*, is not only to put into motion, but to do so often, or in a great degree.—The Latin ampliative *osus*, anciently *usus*, may, in like manner, be considered as a duplicate of the terminating Article, and expresses the Adjective in a great degree. It is the origin of the English *ose*, as in *operose*, exceedingly laborious.

The Saxon *ad*, or *ade*, signifies a mass, or heap, and hence our *add*, to increase by putting to the heap. The French *ade* and the Spanish *ado* are terminations of similar import. Many words with these affixes are adopted in our language, and express a *collection*, or *quantity*, of what the word denotes. Thus *arcade*, is a range of *arches*; and *colonnade*, a collection of *columns*. When these terminations are joined to Verbs, they, evidently, cannot signify number, except by metaphor; in supposing a *continuation*, or *successive renewal*, of action. *Cannonade* is the repeated firing of *cannon*; *bastinado* is a repetition of *basting* or beating with a stick;

Of *ad*, *ade*,
and *ado*.

stick ; and *blockade*, is a continuation of *blocking*, or shutting up, a city or port. Words of this kind which have been long in use have dropped the final *e* and *o*, and end in *ad*, as, *myriad* and *triad*. In some cases we have adopted only the foreign compounds, as, from the French *ambassade*, an embassy, is formed *ambassadeur*, and our ambassador.

of *cide* and *cidal*. From the Latin *cædere*, to kill, we have the termination *cide* which is added to a few words derived from that language ; such as *homicide*, from *homo*, a man, denoting manslaughter ; and *fratricide*, from *frater*, a brother, the killing of brethren. The Adjective is formed by adding *al*, as in *homicidal*, *parricidal*, &c.

of *ward*. “ *Ward* is from the Saxon *wardian*, to look at, “ or to direct the view, and is the same word as “ the French *garder*, which, in a figurative or se- “ condary sense only, means to *protect*, to *keep*, to “ *watch*, to *ward*, or to *guard*. It is the same in “ Latin : *Tutus*, guarded, *looked* after, safe, is the “ past Participle of *Tueor*, *Tuitus*, *Tutus*. So “ *Tutor*, he who *looks* after. So we say either,— “ *Guard* him well, or, *Look* well after him. In “ different places in England, the same agent is very “ properly called either a *Looker*, a *Warden*, a “ *Warder*, an *Overseer*, a *Keeper*, a *Guard*, or a “ *Guardian*. Accordingly this word *ward* may “ with equal propriety be joined to the name of any “ person,

“ person, place, or thing, *to* or *from* which our view or sight may be directed *.”—It is hence that we have such compounds as *backward*, *home-ward*, and *heavenward*, which signify *in the direction of*, or *looking towards* the *back*, *home*, and *heaven*.

The German *art* signifies *species*, *kind*, or *manner*; and the Dutch *aard* is used, both singly and in composition, for *nature*, *temperament*, or *disposition*. The former have *arten*, and the latter *aarden*, to resemble, particularly applied to *disposition* or *temper* of mind. From this source we have compound Nouns with the termination *ard*, all signifying of the *nature* or *kind*, expressed by the word to which it is joined. We have *drunkard*, an habitual drinker; *sluggard*, one of a *slow*, or *lazy* nature; and *coward*, a person of a *timid* disposition.

The *heart* has been generally understood to be the seat of the passions and dispositions of mankind, while the *head* has been left in possession of the reasoning powers. Hence we say “ a clear head,” and “ a *feeling heart*;” and it is thus that *entêté* in French, and *wrongheaded* in English, are expressive of obstinate prepossession and folly. *Hearted*, like *ard*, is used to form compounds denoting *temper*, or *disposition* of mind, as *fainthearted*, *hard-hearted*, *lighthearted*, &c.; and it has been asserted, with some show of probability, that the words were

Hearted and
beaded.

were originally the same. *Headed* forms a sort of counterpart, as *lightheaded*, *wrongheaded*, &c.

Figrative
nature of
Language.

In tracing the origin of words we often arrive at sources very distant from what might have been expected. Speech is almost entirely composed of figure and metaphor. There are but few objects, or relations, in nature with which mankind are acquainted ; and yet it must be solely from these few that our ideas can be formed. Abstract thoughts are the shadows of reality ; but shadows cannot exist without the substances on which they depend. The structure of language, however aerial it may appear, is not a palace of enchantment. The materials of which it is built are taken from the palpable objects around us. They are rude and common in their appearance, while the beauty and fairy elegance of the fabric is owing to the illusions of imagination. Things and actions, the most ordinary and obvious, are, in the most eminent degree, stretched in their signification ; and we compare the primary and consequent meanings of the term with a portion of incredulity, when we are told that the distinction has been produced solely by custom and usage. Examples may be easily adduced : *To sit* and *to stand* are common actions of the human body, but their figurative significations are uncommonly extensive. *A seat* is that on which we *sit*, but it also denotes a *villa*, or country *residence*. *Situation* is literally the *action of sitting*, but it expresses our *manner of existence*, whether in body

body or mind. The Latin *status*, like our *state* *State*, and the French *estat*, or *état*, in its first sense, is merely *a standing*, or the particular posture of the body which *to stand* recalls to our mind. These words, however, signify *condition* of whatever kind; as, also, *a government*, and the *country* so governed. When we adopt the French spelling *estate*, it is used for *a quantity of land* in the possession of a proprietor. The word *stand* is, likewise, subject to a similar figure, and we say of an advocate, who has had long and extensive practice, that he is of considerable *standing* at the bar. *Station* is the *place where any thing stands*;—it is, also, the rank held in society. The Anglo-Saxon *stede*, and the English *stead*, are akin to *state*, and signify *place*. “In their *stead*,” is in their *place*. In composition, *stead* is both a preposition and a termination, as *steady*, *steadfast*; *instead*, *bedstead*, *roadstead*, &c. The inseparable Preposition *step* in *stepfather*, *stepmother*, &c. is a corruption of *stead* or *sted*. *Sted*, in Danish, is *place*, or *stead*; and *stedfader*, *stedmoder*, *stedbroder*, equivalent to our *stepfather*, *stepmother*, *stepbrother*, signify, *in the place of*, or *instead of a father, a mother, &c.*

Similar to the word *state* is the termination *dom.* *Dom.* It denotes *condition* of existence, and, also, whatever is under the *dominion*, or *government*, of another. Thus *kingdom*, is a country under the *government* of a *king*, and *freedom*, is the *state*, or *condition*, of being *free*. The termination in both cases is the same,

same, and the distinction arises from the words to which it is joined: The *state* of being *free* does not imply a figure very different from the original meaning of the term; but that of a *king* suggests a separate idea;—it is necessarily connected with *grandeur* and with *power*. From the Greek *demo*, I build, was formed *domos*, the Latin *domus*, and our *dome*, a house. *Dominus*, among the Romans, was its *master*; and, by an easy transition, the name of the habitation of a family came to signify that of a nation.—*Dominus* was a *state*, or *country*, and *dominus*, its *lord*. From the same root is *domineer*, *tame*, &c.; but to dwell longer on this subject would be to anticipate our future explanations.

of *head*, or
body.

Among all nations the *head* has been considered as the *principal*, or *directing*, part of the human body. It is hence that *head* is used for a *leader*, or *governor*; and hence, also, it denotes the *chief feature* in any thought or expression. Thus, we say, “the *head* of the government,” and, “the “*head* of an army,” referring to the *monarch* and the *general*. The *heads* of a discourse, are the *principal*, or *leading*, ideas from which it is formed. In composition it is sometimes literal and at other times figurative. As a prefix we have *heady*, *headiness*, *headach*, &c. As a termination it is generally spelt *hood*, and forms abstract Nouns. It denotes the *principle* from which the Noun derives its existence. It is that which constitutes its *essence*; and is a general name for the *state* which the word describes.

describes. It is thus that we shall have to explain, *brotherhood, childhood, knighthood, manhood, &c.*

There are other terminations of the same signification with *head*, which are likewise expressive of general qualities. *Chief*, from the French *chef*, the head, denotes a leader. As an Adjective it signifies *principal*, or that which is *first*, and consequently of most importance ; and as an affix it has exactly the same meaning. *Mischief*, is very great, or *chief*, or *head*, wrong. *Kerchief*, is a *cover* for the *head*.

We have before observed, in the comparison of *languages*, that there is a regular gradation from *k* to *sh*, and from this variation of orthography we have several words, which are, respectively, of synonymous origin, and differ only in the circumstances in which they are now applied. It is thus that we have *shake* and *quake*; *shiver* and *quiver*; *short* and *curt*; *shrink* and *cringe*; *shy* and *coy*, &c. The Latin *caput*, the German *kopf*, the French *chef*, the German termination *schaft*, the Dutch *schap*, the Danish *skab*, the Saxon *scipe*, and our *ship*, all signify *head*. In *landskip* or *landscape*, it is used with the harder sound ; and in Scotland this mode of pronunciation is general, as, *masterskip* for *mastership*, *heirskip* for *heirship*, &c.

Ness is said to come from the Latin *nasus*, the *nose*, which is the most *prominent* part of the face, as the *head* is of the body. This derivation is not improbable ; for the ludicrous idea which it sometimes

times conveys, in modern English, is merely an idiom of the language. But, however this may be, the word is now used by itself solely to signify a *promontory*, or *headland*; and, as an affix is equivalent to *head*, or *chief*. *Brotherliness* is used in place of *brotherlihood*; and *mischief*, when further compounded, becomes *remissness*.

Of *ce*, *cy*,
ity, *tude*, and
th.

The Romans marked their Nouns of generality by *tia*, *tas*, or *tudo*. The first of these is formed, in English, by *ce*, or *cy*, as, *abundantia*, becomes *abundance*, and *clementia*, *clemency*, both expressing the abstract state, or principle, which might otherwise be exactly noted by *aboundingness* and *justness*. *Tas* and *tudo*, like the French *tête* (another name for the head,) is Englished by *ty*, or *ity*, and *tude*. *Honestas*, in Latin, and *honnetéte* in French, are both translated by the word *honesty*, which might be well enough expressed by *honesthead*, or *honestness*. *Ty* is a substitute for *tith*, *y* and *th* being interchangeable, as before-mentioned; and many words in *ty* were formerly terminated with *tith*. *Poortith* is still used in Scotland for *poverty*; and in old law writings, *widuitie* signified *widowhood*. *Virginity* and *maidenhead* are synonymous. *Tith* and *tude* have an evident fraternity, and consequently words in *tude* are of the same class with those above-mentioned. They generally come immediately from the Latin *tudo*; as, *amplitudo*, *amplitude*, *ampleness* or *greatness*; and *multitudo*, *multitude*, or *manyness*. Occasionally the *d* in *tude* is suppressed,

pressed, as in *virtue*, from *vir*, Latin, a man, originally signifying *manhood*, and figuratively *courage*, which was the first of *virtues* among the Romans. *Th*, abbreviated into *th*, forms the concluding letters of many of our monosyllables ; and adds the principle of abstraction to the words to which it is joined. Hence we have *sloth*, slowness ; *mirth*, merriness ; *length*, longness, or longitude, with many others : all of which may be explained in the same manner as words in *tude*, *ty*, *head*, *ship*, or *ness*. Words in *th* were formerly in many cases terminated in *the*, and those in *ch* in *che*. *Birth*, *death* ; *such* and *which*, were spelt *birthe*, *dethe* ; *soche* and *whiche* : and on our principles this orthography must have been more consonant with etymology. The final *e* was once exceedingly general, though now nearly discarded from the language. It had originally been vocal ; and, in a certain stage of our literature, the Poets seem to have either suppressed its sound, or formed it into an additional syllable, as best suited their ideas of the harmony of verse. “ Chaucer preserves or “ sinks the sound of his syllables arbitrarily, to “ suit his own convenience ; the reader is fre- “ quently unable at a glance to discover his scheme “ of harmony, and it is extremely difficult to do “ justice to his versification in the act of reading “ his poetry aloud to an auditor*.”

The terms in which we would signify the relations *Arch.*

* GODWIN'S LIFE OF CHAUCER.

tions of society must be borrowed from the *situation*, either as to time or place, of the common objects around us; and here *priority* is a distinguished emblem of eminence. *Arch*, from the Greek *archon*, a prince, or governor, was formerly used, by English writers, for a *chief*, or *leader*, in which sense it is to be found in Shakespeare. It is now in use only as an Adjective and in composition. We have *arch rogue*, a principal or *great* rogue; *archangel*, a chief angel; and *archbishop*, the head, or chief, bishop, who presides over a number of others. This word originally denoted *priority*, in point of time, the Greek *arche* signifying *beginning*, and, figuratively, *principal*, or *chief*, following the same rule with the Latin *principium*. It is in this sense that it appears in *archetype*. As a termination it signifies a *governor*, and compounded with *y* it forms *archy*, government. From the Greek *monos*, single, we have *monarch*, one who governs alone, and, from *a* privative we have *anarchy*, the absence of all government.

Of *fy* and its compounds.

The Latin *facere*, to make, originates several of our terminations. *Fy*, is make, and *faction*, the action of making. From thence we have *to deify*, to make one a God; *to fructify*; to make or to produce fruit; and *to purify*, to make pure. From these again, are formed *deification*, *fructification* and *purification*, expressing the action of the different Verbs. The termination *fy* is variously compounded with others, as, *ic*, *atory*, &c. *active*,

forming

forming *fic*, *ficatory*, *fictive*, &c. whose powers may be easily ascertained by comparing their different parts with the explanations already given. Thus *prolific*, from *proles*, Latin, a race, or progeny, indicates that what we mention possesses the property of producing, or is of a generating kind.

There are other terminations from *facere*, as, *feit*, *fit*, *ficient*, &c. but these form the basis, or principal part, of the compounds in which they are found, and, therefore, the proper place for their examination will be the Dictionary. The same observation may be made with regard to many other affixes, as *ply*, *ple*, or *ble*, a fold, in the words *simple*, *double*, *comply*, *reply*, &c.; *tract*, from the Latin *trahere*, to draw, in *contract*, *extract*, *retract*, &c.; *pose*, *sent*, *sign*, *spire*, *tain*, *tend*; and many others, which will be noticed as they occur. Presuming, therefore, that we have sufficiently discussed all that are necessary for our present purpose, we shall proceed to the investigation of those syllables that are used as Prefixes or Prepositions. A few of these have been already noticed, having naturally presented themselves when treating of the terminal affixes.

Every sentence, containing an *agent* and an *action*, is complete; but there are, always, accessory circumstances which may or may not be attended to: The *result*, or *effect*, may be specified, which is either a Noun, or a Pronoun in the Accusative

Termina-
tions which
form the
basis of their
compounds.

of Preposi-
tions.

case ; the *manner* of the performance may be stated, by an Adverb ; and the *qualities* of the Nouns may be marked, by Adjectives.—Besides, every *exertion*, or *thing*, must stand at a certain point, and occupy a particular portion, of space, which can only be defined by referring to the place occupied by objects already known. Words that express the *situation* of one Noun with respect to another have been termed Prepositions ; and, though used to denote general relations, must originally have been the names of objects or of actions. The expression of *situation* is their distinguishing characteristic ; and, as this is only observable from the conjunction, or from the degree of the separation of things, it is on comparison alone that their being depends. We say that one thing is *in* or *out* ; *before* or *after* ; *on* or *off* ; *to* or *from* ; *on this side* or *on that*, of another ; and such words and phrases are what Grammarians have called Prepositions. Their name suggests no idea of their nature. The Latin derivation from *præ*, before, and *positus*, set or placed, might, in our language, be equally well applied to Adjectives ; for they, too, are *placed before* Nouns. The order of arrangement is different among different nations. The Adjectives in French, and the Prepositions in Turkish and Hungarian, seldom precede, but generally follow, the Substantives with which they are connected in construction.

In the Greek, Latin, and other languages which have declensions from their Nouns, Prepositions are said to *govern*, respectively, one or other of the cases ; and, in English, when followed by a Pronoun, it is usually in the objective state. This *government* which one word exercises over another is not real but figurative ; and the misapprehensions of certain Etymologists, in a similar case, is well (though rather forcibly) illustrated by Mr Tooke.

“ These Gentlemen,” says he, “ seem to think “ that *translation* is *explanation*. Nor have they “ ever yet ventured to ask themselves, what they “ mean ; when they say that any word *comes* from, “ is *derived* from, *produced* from, *originates* from, “ or *gives birth to*, any other word. Their igno- “ rance and idleness make them contented with “ this vague and misapplied metaphorical lan- “ guage.”—They do not “ consider that words “ have no *loco-motive* faculty, that they do not *flow* “ like rivers, nor *vegetate* like plants, nor *spiculate* “ like salts, nor are *generated* like animals ;”— “ and yet, until they can get rid of these metaphors “ from their *minds*, they will not themselves be fit “ for etymology, nor furnish any etymology fit for “ reasonable men *.” The Case of a Noun does not depend upon the preceding Verb or Preposition. The *governing* and the *governed* are collateral and corresponding effects of the same cause—the

Government of
Preposi-
tions.

state of the different objects in the mind of the writer. When a Substantive is the *agent* of an *action*, it is announced by its *name*, or Nominative. In every other state it must be attended by words that express its situation. These when separate are termed Prepositions, and when added to the Noun they form Declensions. When we say, "John went after *him*," it is not because it follows the word *after* that the Pronoun is in the Accusative, but because the person represented by the word *him* is not considered as an *actor* in the sentence; otherwise we should say, "John went after *he* went," making two assertions in place of one. Verbs and Prepositions are the pictures, but not the energies themselves; and whatever authority they may be supposed to acquire over the modifications of Nouns, must be derived, by delegation, from their prototypes in Nature. Words impressed upon the page are like figures on the canvas. We see mountains and plains, seas and rivers, woods and lawns, diversified at the pleasure of the painter; but the individuals of the groupe exist independent on one another. The waving foliage of the tree may be reflected from the stream, but it contains no dryad to hang, at will, its branches over the brink;—it is passive in the hands of a superior power.

It is repeated concurrence that leads to the combination of the elementary syllables of words, and constitutes in one vocable what had originally been

two. Prepositions are so generally attendant on Nouns that the separation is gradually disregarded; and, accordingly, they form the far greater part of the Prefixes of the English tongue. It is hence that we have *income*, *outgoings*, *BEFOREmentioned*, *AFTERmentioned*, &c. besides a numerous class adopted from the Prepositions of other nations. To exhibit the force and effect of these various Prefixes is our present object:—

Motion proceeds by *beginning* at one point and *ending* at another. “A stone falls,” but there is a place where it began to fall, and there is another where it will stop. These places are denominated by Nouns, but some qualification must necessarily be adjected to denote the use to which they are applied: “the stone falls, *beginning* at the window “and *ending* at the ground.” Words synonymous with *beginning* and *end*, when speaking of the place, or time, of action, must therefore be frequently employed. They point out certain relations, or situations, of the agent, and consequently they come under the class of Prepositions. In English, *from* and *to* are, in the sense we have mentioned, equivalent to *beginning* and *end*. “The stone falls *from* “the window *to* the ground.” The origin of these Particles has already been investigated. *From* is *beginning*, *author*, or *source*. *To* is the *end*, or *completion*, of an action. *From* and *to* may be used where there has been no progression, as, “the “lamp *hangs from* the cieling,” and “the grease

“sticks to the floor.” In the former case, the *cieling* is the place where the attachment *commences*; and, in the latter, the *floor* is the place on which the grease has fallen, and to which it adheres. *From* is, in some cases, synonymous with *cause*, as, “he loved *from* habit.” This is merely a different view of the word, as denoting *origin*, or *source*. His love *arose* or *began* at habit,—habit was the *source*, or *cause*, of his love.

apo, *a*, *ab*,
and *abs*.

Alpha, the name of the first letter of the Greek Alphabet, and answering to our A, was figuratively used to express *first* or *beginning*. From hence, most probably, is the Greek *apo*, forming the contracted aspirate *aph'* and the Latin *a*, *ab*, or *abs*; all, whether single or in composition, exactly corresponding with our *from*. Compounds from these Prepositions have, with slight variation, been transferred to the English language:—*Apostle*, from *apo* and the Greek *stello*, I send, signifies a messenger, or one sent *from* another; *apocalypse*, from *kalypto*, I hide, is hidden *from*; and *apostate* is one who stands away *from*, or has left, a particular sect, or opinion. *A*, *ab*, or *abs*, vary with the initials of the words to which they are joined. *Ab* is written before a vowel, *abs* before *c* or *t*, and *a* before every other consonant. *To abstain* is to hold *from*; *to abstract* is to draw *from*; *to avert* is to turn *from*; and *to absolve* is to free *from*: compounded from the Latin Verbs *tenere*, to hold; *trahere*, to draw; *vertere*, to turn; and *solvere*, to free, or loosen.

It is evident that what have been termed inseparable Prepositions modify the words to which they are joined, only by a reference to other words in the sentence. *To abstract*, to draw *from*, must point by its Preposition to some object *from* whence the thing *drawn* had its *origin*. If this source, or *FROM*, be not expressed, the compound is left *indefinite*, and denotes the action in general. *A, ab*, or *abs*, is usually prefixed to Verbs or their derivatives, and in such situations will naturally suggest the idea of *separation*, or *distance*, which the Preposition alone does by no means represent. In this view it is, in some cases, united to Nouns and qualities, marking the thing which *proceeds*, or is *taken away from* something else. The Greek *α* had this privative power. *Bubos, bythos*, signifies *a bottom*. The Ionic dialect changed the *th* into *ss*, and hence, with *α* privative, was formed *Abyssos, Abyssos*, *wanting a bottom*, the origin of our *Abyss*. The Latin synonyme is *profundum*, from *fundus*, *a bottom*, or *foundation*, and *pro*, before, metaphorically *away from*, or *distant*. To avoid the hiatus the Greeks interposed an *n* between succeeding vowels, and it is therefore that *α* becomes *an* in *anarchy*, &c.

The Latin *ad* is allied to *to* as *ab* is to *from*. The *Ad* words are opposed to one another. *Ab*, and *from*, are the *origin* or *beginning*. *Ad*, (*at*,) and *to*, are the *effect*, *result*, or *end*. In composition the *d* in *ad* is often exchanged for a duplicate of the following letter, and the prefix becomes *ac, af, ag, al, an,*

an, ap, ar, as, or at, as in accord, affront, aggression, &c. The explanation of words in *ad* will be obvious from attending to our account of *ab*; for the remarks on the composition of the latter are, in some degree, applicable to all the other Prepositions. *To adjoin* is to join *to*; *to adhere* is to stick *to*; *to adduce* is to bring *to*, &c.

de. The Latin Preposition *de* is synonymous with our *of* already mentioned. *Ab* is *beginning*.—*De* is *separation*;—*a part* taken from a *whole*, making that *off*, or *separate*, which was formerly *on*, or *one* with the whole mass. *On* is complete junction, forming a union between the primary substance and that which is brought *to* it. *Upon* is a species of *on*. It is *on* the upper side. *Ab* and *de*, *from* and *of*, may be often substituted respectively for one another. “I lifted the stone *from* the ground,” and “I lifted the stone *off* the ground,” are equally expressive of the action; but *from* states where the stone was when I *began* to lift it, and *off* directs us to the substance *from* which it was *separated*. “I lifted the stone *from* the ground *into* the wagon”—“I lifted it *off* the ground *on* which it was laid.” The Latins had “*tollere de terra*,” or, “*tollere a terra*,” to raise *off* or *from*, the ground, as the different views directed. *De* is in every case synonymous with *off*. By figure it signifies *about*, *concerning*, *after*, &c. and in French it is the sign of the genitive—of something *belonging to*, or *sprung from*, another. It is in composition only that *de* appears

appears in English, having been transferred with its compounds from the Latin. From what we have already said, its meaning will be obvious. It expresses being *off*, or *away from*, something to which the word refers, or *from* what the word itself simply denotes. The latter has been termed its privative power ; and, as we illustrated in the cases of *in* and *un*, it must sometimes *undo* what has been *done* : *To debar* is to *bar from*, or to *separate* ; *to decamp* is to change one's camp or residence ; *to decompose* (the opposite of *compose*) is to resolve into its constituent parts ; *to decrease* (the reverse of *growth*) is to *ungrow*, or to grow less ; *to despair*, from *spero*, I hope, is to want hope,—and so of others.

The inseparable Preposition *dis* (*di* before certain consonants) was probably derived by the Romans from the Greek *dis*, twice. It denotes that a thing once *whole*, or *compounded*, is now *divided*, or *separated* ; and, in as far as its usage is extended, it is equivalent to *de*, with which, perhaps, it has a common origin. The Etymologies of *on* from *one* and of *dis* from *two* are completely analogous. *Dis*, or *di*, is a very general English Prefix. *To divide* is to separate so as the parts may be observed, from the Latin *videre*, to see ; *to disconcert* is to separate those who had concerted together ; and *to dismantle* is to take *off* the mantle with which a thing is covered. *Dis* sometimes drops the *s* and assumes the initial consonant of the word to which it is joined : as, *different*, literally set asunder, from

Di and *dis*.

the

the Latin *fero*, I carry; and *to diffuse*, to spread abroad, from *fusus*, poured out.

Sz. The Latin prefix *se* may be accurately Englished by the words *off*, *away from*, *aside*, or *apart*. From the Latin *cedere*, to yield, or give place to, we have *to secede*, to depart, to go aside or away from any thing with which we were formerly connected; *to seduce* is to lead astray, from *ducere*, to lead; and *to select*, from *legere*, to gather, is to chuse out from a number.

Semi, *demi*, and *hemi*. Compounding *se* with *mi* (the root of the Greek *μεσος*, *mesos*, the Latin *medius*, the French *mi*, and our *middle*, all of the same signification) the Latins formed *semi*, the half; literally, one of the divisions of any thing divided in the *middle*. *Semi* was much used in composition, and from thence we have such words as *semicircle*, half of a circle, and *semimetal*, a half metal, that is, imperfect, having but *half* the qualities of a metal. *Half* is also used in the latter sense; and, when a thing is not well or completely performed, we say it is done by *halves*, or only *half* done. *De* and *se* being similar, we have *demi*, equivalent to *semi*, a half. Hence we have *demigod*, half human, half divine, with some others. We have also a few words in *hemi*, a Greek inseparable Preposition of the same force as *senii* and *demi*. *Hemisphere* is half of a sphere, and *hemistich* the half of a verse.

Numerals
and other
marks of
quantity.

Numerals from their general occurrence, often become prefixes, and compounds from the Greek and

and Latin languages are adopted with the original expression of quantity. We shall notice the most common, with an instance of the application of each. Some of these are seldom used ; but they may be deemed worthy of attention, because scientific writers have assumed the liberty of increasing their compounds at pleasure :—

Mono and *uni* are from the Greek *μόνος* and the Latin *unus*, one : *Monotony* is sameness of tone, and *uniform* is of one form. *Bi*, or *bis*, is from the Latin *bis*, twice ; as *biped*, one who has two feet. *Tre*, or *tri*, is from the Greek *τρεῖς* and the Latin *tres*, three ; as in *triangle*, a figure with three angles. *Tetra* is the Greek *τετράς*, four. *Tetrachord* is a musical instrument with four strings. *Quadri*, or *quadru*, is from the Latin *quatuor*, four ; as in *quadruple*, fourfold. *Pent* is the Greek *πεντέ*, five : *Pentagon*, from *γωνία*, *gonia*, an angle, denotes a figure having five angles. *Quinque* and *quintu* are the Latin *quinque*, five, and *quintus*, the fifth. *Quinquennial* is consisting of five years, and *quintuple* is fivefold. *Hex* is the Greek *ἕξ*, six, as in *hexameter*, the denomination for a verse of six feet ; and *sex* is Latin for six, as in *sextant*, containing a sixth part of a whole, as of a circle, &c. *Hept* and *sept* are from the Greek *επτά* and the Latin *septem*, seven : *Heptarchy* is a name for the seven Saxon Governments of England, and *September* was the seventh month of the Roman year. *Octa* or *Octo*, is from the Greek *οκτώ* and the

Latin

Latin *octo*, eight; and hence we have *octahedron*, (compounded from ἑξ, abase or seat,) a solid having eight sides. *Deca* and *decem* are from the Greek δέκα and the Latin *decem*, ten: *Decade* is a collection of ten, as ten days, ten weeks, &c. and to *decimate* is to take the tenth part. *Cent*, from the Latin *centum*, a hundred, forms *centennial*, belonging to a hundred years; and *millennium* comes from *mille*, a thousand. *Pan*, from the Greek πᾶν, and *omni* from the Latin *omnis*, all, or every, appear in *pandemonium*, the palace of all the demons, and *omnipotent*, all-powerful. *Poly* is from the Greek πολυς and *multi* from the Latin *multus*, many. *Polygamy*, from γαμεω, gameo, I marry, is many marriages, and *multiform* is having many shapes or forms. *Holo* is from ὅλος, whole, as in *holocaust*, (from οἴω, I burn,) a sacrifice in which every part of the victim was consumed. *Soli* is from the Latin *solus*, alone; and hence *soliloquy* (from *loquor*, I speak,) is a discourse which a person utters when alone. *Magna* in Latin is great, and the Greek *micro* (μικρος) is small. *Magnanimous* is having a great mind, and *micrometer* is a measurer of small spaces.

Per and *dia*. On the supposition of the motion of a body its course may be marked by describing the medium, or substance, through which it passes. Words expressing this relation must state that one body *divides*, *cuts*, or *separates* another; or that it passes *through* an opening already made. *Through*, *thro'*, or *thorough*, is the Saxon *thruh* and *thuruh*, the same

same with *thure*, *thura*, or *dura*, a door; or passage. The Dutch use *door* equally for the Noun and the Preposition. The Greek *dia* (probably from *dis*) signifies *passage* from one end of a space or period to the other. Words formed with this prefix are directly from that language, and are generally confined to scientific terms. Thus *diameter* is the measure across or *through* any thing: The *diameter* of a circle is the measure of its breadth. The Latin *per* is from the Greek περω, *peiro*, to perforate or pass *through*, the equivalent and origin of our Verb *to pierce*. As a prefix it marks, literally, *passage through* any medium, and, figuratively, *through what* means any action is accomplished. In the latter sense it answers to our *by*. *Per*, being from *one end to the other*, also denotes the completion of an action, and to say that a thing is *perfected* is the same as if we should say that it is *thoroughly made*. This use is very general in composition. From the Latin *suadere*, to advise, we have *to persuade*, to advise with effect, or to convince; and in its primitive sense we have *to perish*, from the Latin *perire* (*per*, through, and *ire*, to go) to go through or to disappear, and figuratively to die.

In the Preposition *trans* the Latins attended only to the circumstance of passing *away* from one place or state to another. Though this passage might have been made *across* a river, or *over* a mountain, yet there was no necessary allusion to the medium through which it was directed, as is included in the

Trans and
meta.

word

word *per*. It is therefore Englished by *over*, *beyond*, *on the other side*, &c. *Transmarine* is *over* the sea; *to transplant* is to move a plant from one place to another; and *to transpose* is to put away *to* another or opposite place. In many compounds *trans* is equivalent to *per* and *through*, because the body through which the other moves is brought into view. *Translucent* and *transparent* are the respective qualities of allowing the *light* and other objects to pass *through*. In composition before certain consonants it is contracted into *tra*, as *tradition*, *trajection*, &c. When *trans* is applied to words where removal refers to appearance, and not to distance, it induces the idea of *change*: Thus *to transform* is to change the form, and *transfiguration* is the change of figure. The same idea is expressed by the Greek *meta*, in the composition of words. *Metamorphosis*, from *μεταφορή*, *morphosis*, a form, is the change of form, and *metaphor*, from *φέρω*, *phero*, I bring, is equivalent to the Latin *translatio*; and signifies that a word is *translated*, or changed, from its proper acceptation to another which is figurative.

Re and *red*.

Though we do not find the word used except in composition, yet it is probable that the Latin *re* had originally signified *the back*. From the same source we have *rear* (and the French *arrière*, &c.), the *back* or *binder* part, generally applied to the last division of a fleet or army. *To rein* is to keep back; *to rest* is to remain or stay *behind*; and *restive* is *backward*.

When

When *back* is applied to action, it may, by an easy metaphor, signify *again*. *To go back*, or in the direction of the *back*, is to go *again* over the same course. *To give back* any thing is to *return* it, or give it *again*. It is in this sense that the Preposition *re* was generally used by the Latins, though its primary signification, *back*, was more attended to than is commonly imagined. “ *Reponere*, for example, “ (from *ponere*, to place) is either *to put AGAIN* “ with reference to *time*, or *to put BACK* in a retired “ part with reference to *place*. *Recludere* (from “ *cludere*, to shut), is *to open*, because it reverses by “ a traversing of the same *place*, or a *repetition* (or “ *going back*) of a similar process, the action of “ *shutting**.” Our word *recluse* presents another figure of the particle *re*. It signifies shut up in a retired place, as if *back*, or away from observation. *To repose*, from the Latin *ponere*, has also the varied senses which we have given to the Preposition *re*. It signifies *to place again* or *to replace*, and also *to keep back*, or to lay up in reserve, in a private situation. These different significations of *re* are common in the composition of English words. We have *to repel*, (from the Latin *pellere*, to drive,) *to beat back*; *to return*, *to turn back*; and *to recoil*, *to fall back* with rapidity and fear,—shrinking into a smaller space like the *coil* of a rope. *Recondite*, from the Latin *condere*, to hide, is *secret*, or hidden in a place, *back* or *remote* from *view*. *Remote* is a form

of

of the past Participle *removed*. *To remove* is literally to *move back* or away :—It has also the figurative meaning, *to move again*. *To rehear* is to hear *again*; *to remake* is to make *anew*; and *to remount* is to mount another time. *Re*, when placed before vowels is often followed by a *d* to avoid the hiatus, in the same manner that the French interpose a *t* between Verbs ending in a vowel and the initial vowel of the following word, and write *aima-t-il* for *aima il*. From this mode of orthography we have such words as *redundant*, flowing over or *back again*, from the Latin *unda*, a wave; and *to redeem*, to purchase *back*, from *emere*, to buy.

Retro.

Re has been usually considered as an abbreviation of *retro*. The latter however is more probably a compound of the former with *trans*. Its power in the Latin language, both singly and in composition, is favourable to this etymology; and it evidently is analogous to *contra* and *extra* afterwards to be explained. With respect to place it signifies *back from*, and with regard to time it denotes a period that is *past*. Including *trans* in its meaning, it speaks of a place or time *at a certain distance*. It is in the direction of *back*, but it is also *beyond*. The few words which we have with this prefix will be evident; for instance *retrospection*, from the Latin *spectare*, to view, is the *view* of our *past* actions; for it is seldom applied in its literal sense, as the looking *back* upon the path which we have travelled over.

The

The Greek *ana*, in composition, is equivalent to *re*. *An anachronism*, (from *καιρός*, time,) is an error in the computation of dates by which an event is placed further *back*, or earlier than it happened ; things *analogous*, (from *λόγος*, a speech or discourse,) are such as we may speak of or define in the same manner,—such as may be explained by using *again* the same words ; and *to analyze* (from *λύω*, I loose,) like *to resolve*, from *solvere* to *free*, is to separate a compound into its primitive principles.

The Latin *post* is properly translated *after*, whether alone or in composition : *To postdate* is to date *after* the real time, and *postexistence* is an *after* or future existence. *Post* differs from *re* in denoting the *situation* of one thing with respect to another, whereas *re* is expressive of the change of the *direction* of motion to its opposite. We already remarked that *before* and *after* can be ascertained only from the comparison of events. One thing is *placed* or *moved*, and *then*, or *that done*, the other is *situated*, or *follows*. *Post* is from *ponere*, to place ; whence *positus*, placed, which is sometimes contracted into *postus*, in the same manner that our word *posture* is derived from *positura* :—*Pone*, though not so common, was also used by the Latin writers for *after* or *behind*. *Post hunc diem*, after this day, signifies this day being *placed* or set by. Our word *past* has sometimes a like meaning. The Latin *pes* is the *foot* ; the French *pas* is a *step* ;

and *passer* is literally *to walk*. “ He came *past* the “ appointed hour” denotes that the hour proposed had *passed* or *gone by*. *Post* does not include the idea of distance ;—it may be *at* or *upon*. *Post tertium diem* is *on* the third day ; and *to postfix* is to fix *to* the *after* side. The fact is that *post* expresses the *order of place* only, and proximity, or distance, is either supposed, or marked by the other parts of the sentence.

Fore and
for.

The appearance and qualities of the most common objects are transferred to others by imagined similitude. *Face* and *front* (from the Latin *frons*, the forehead,) are supposed to be applicable to inanimate substances, though the words were originally limited to the human frame. It is thus that we speak of the *front* or *face* of a building, as that portion of its surface which bears the greatest analogy to the *face* of a man. This being once established, we speak of the *back* of a house, and of its *right* and *left wings*. The exposure to which the word *front* is more strictly applicable is that in which is situated the *porch* or *entry*. It is there that we are to pass in order to examine its internal structure, in the same manner that we *face* the person with whom we wish to be acquainted :—Hence, the place of entry has constituted another name for that side of the building. The Latin *foris* (from the Greek *θύρα*, *thura*, in the Doric *φύρα*, *phura*,) signifies a door ; and the Adverb *foras* or *foris* is *out of doors*, equivalent to our word *forth*. The

English

English Adjective *fore* when applied to a building expresses the *door face*, or front ; and of any other object it is that side which is most exposed to view or use. *Fore* is opposed to *back* ; *before* to *behind* ; and *forward* to *backward*. *Before* is *by the foreside* ; and, from being originally a mark of *prior situation*, has acquired an extended signification from metaphor and allusion. To stand *before* one is to usurp his situation.—He was formerly *first* or *foremost*, but is now last ; and hence *fore* came to signify *in place of*. In this case it is spelt *for*, and “ to fight *for* “ another” is to fight *in the place of* another. To do any action *in the place of* or *for* another, especially if that action be accompanied with difficulty or danger, suggests the idea of *favour* or *advantage* to the individual in whose place we stand :—*On account of* is therefore a very general use of the word *for*, and is the meaning that it bears when termed a Conjunction.

For as *on account of* is not an uncommon stretch of figure. When we say “ he did it *for* these reasons,” we mean that these *reasons* went *before* and determined his conduct. This is exactly the same as if we had said “ he did it in *consequence of* “ these reasons ;”—*consequence*, from the Latin *sequor*, I follow, expressing that the action *followed* or was *after* its motive. It is thence that *for* has been considered as synonymous with *cause*. Some Philosophers have asserted that we can have no other idea of *cause* and *effect* than, that the one is

Expressions
of CAUSE.

observed regularly to *follow* the other; and, indeed, the general structure of language appears in their favour. *To produce* is merely to bring *forward*, from the Latin *pro*, *before*, and *ducere*, to lead. *Effect*, from *ex*, out of, and *factus*, made, is *made out of*, and therefore *after* another. *Premises* (from *præ* and *missus*, sent before) and *consequences*, have not naturally a necessary connection:—They signify only *things* of which the *one* is *before* and the *other* *after* in point of time.

For signifying *against* and *out*.

As standing *before* another may be supposed to be an *obstruction* or *hinderance*, *for* also signifies *opposition*, which is a word from a similar source. The French formerly had *fors*, in place of their present *hors*, signifying *without* or *out of doors*, like the Latin *foris*. In this sense they have yet many compounds, some of which we have adopted, as, *to foreclose*, to shut *out*, &c. The use of *for* as *against* and *out* is confined to composition. *For* is generally in possession of the derivative meanings, while *fore* and *before* are more particularly indicative of *priority* either in time or place. Both words are the same, but, when two orthographies are adopted, it is not uncommon to apply one to the more obvious and the other to the consequent meaning. Of this we have an instance in the word *some* or *sum*, already explained, and various examples might be given from other languages. The Dutch *voor* answers equally to our *for* and *fore*, except in composition where *voor* is used to ex-

press

press *priority* like our *fore*; and *ver* to mark *opposition* like *for*. Thus they have *voorstaan* (to stand before,) *to protect*, or *defend*; and *verbieden* to *forbid*. We have very few words beginning with *for*, but in the Saxon this prefix was used in all its senses; as, *before*, *opposed to*, *out*, and *because*. We might illustrate our definition of *for* and *fore* by examples, but our present business with these words is only as prefixes. *To forbid* is *to oppose* what has been bidden; *forward* is in the *direction* of *before*, and, metaphorically, *impudent*; *to forbear* is to bear *forward*, or *to carry* to a future period what we might now execute; *foreknowledge* is *previous knowledge*; and *forehead* is the *front* or *forepart* of the head.

In the learned tongues, the different senses in which *fore* is understood are also observed in their Prepositions which express priority. The Greek *anti* signifies *instead of* or *on account of*; and in composition it denotes *opposed to*, or *against*; as, *antichristian*, *against christianity*, and *anticourtier*, one who *opposes* the court. The Latin derivative *ante* denotes *before* in its ordinary application to place and time. As a prefix it has the same meaning. *To antedate* is to date *before* the time; *antemeridian* is *before* meridian or mid-day; and, in a house, a room that leads to another is spelt both ways,—*antechamber* and *antichamber*. The *i* in *anti* is occasionally suppressed when preceding a vowel,

vowel, as, *antagonist* (from *αγων*, *agon*, Greek, a combat,) one who *opposes*, or fights *against* another.

Ob. *Ob* is another Latin Preposition having the power of *fore* or *for*, both alone and in its compounds. It begins several English words, and, like some other prefixes, drops the *b*, and, assuming the initial of the word to which it is joined, becomes *oc*, *of*, &c. *Obligation*, from the Latin *ligare*, to tie, is the action of binding *before hand*, by a promise or otherwise. *Obstruction*, from *structus*, built, is something built *before* one,—in the way so as to be a hinderance. Words often vary their signification according to the views in which they are presented: To *efficiate*, from *ob* and *facere*, to do, or perform, is to perform any act *for* another, while *efficious* is *too much* in the way;—troublesome by *obtruding services*. *Officer* is literally one who acts *for* or in the *service* of another; and, if *an officer* sometimes imply a *superior* or *commander*, it is only in alluding to those over whom his *office* is extended; for, with respect to his employer, he is a servant:

“I should have been your *officer* and proud *to serve* “you. The king makes me your companion. This “commission gives me a troop of horse *.”

Pro and
pre.

The Greek and Latin *pro*, and the Latin *per* and *præ* have all a common origin, from *πρειν* to pierce or pass through. We have already explained the Preposition

Preposition *per*. *Pro* and *præ* (in English *pre*) are equivalent to *for* or *fore*, and differ from *per* as *fore* from *through*. Both express an *entry* or *passage*; but in the one we attend to the circumstance of *entering* or *passing*, and in the other to the *place* or *situation of the entry*. From *pro* we have *porch*, a gate; and *port*, an entry, from the Latin *porta*. The Greek *pro* is used to signify *before* in time or place; *for*, *on account of*, and *in place of*; and *forth* or *out of*. The Latin *pro* was more seldom applied as *before*, but usually as *for*, while *præ* had in general an opposite usage. *Pro* and *præ* were the *for* and *fore* of the Romans. The compounds from these Prepositions are numerous in our language, and are, for the most part, derived from the Latin. *To proceed*, from *cedere*, to depart, is to go *forward*; *to procure*, from *curare*, to take care of, is to manage or transact *for* another; and *to profane* from *fanum*, a temple, is to act *against* things that are sacred. *A pre-engagement* is a *fore engagement*; *to prejudge* is to judge *beforehand*; and *to preside*, from *sedere*, to sit, is to sit *before* or *have authority over* others. *To pronounce* from *nuncio*, I tell, is to speak *out*; *to provoke* from *vocare* to call, is to call *forth* or *forward*; and *to preclude*, from *cludere* to close, is to shut *out*.

Preter, (in Latin *præter*), is *præ tra*, and has the *Preter.* conjoined meanings of *præ* and *trans*. It is therefore used to signify *before*, but *separate from*, *beside* or *over and above* that to which it is near. It also denotes

denotes *opposed to*, arising from the idea that it is *far before*, or *beyond* another. It is found in *preter-natural*, *beyond*, or *opposite* to what is *natural*, and in a few other words.

Sub. The Latin *sub* signifies *near*, but *under*. It is *immediately* or *closely underneath*. In its general signification, both alone and in composition, it denotes *under* with respect to *place*, and, figuratively, *after* with regard to *time* or *station* in life. When applied to qualities it expresses their existence in an *inferior* degree. As an English prefix it has the same power as in Latin: *Subaltern*, from the Latin *alter*, another, is one that has an office or situation *under* another; *to subdivide* is to *under divide*, or divide the parts of what has already been divided; *subacid* is *acid* in a small degree, or *nearly acid*, and so of others. In expressing *nearness*, *sub* is employed by a figure common to several of the Prepositions, as *con*, *by*, &c. *Sub* is *below*, but no distance is necessary. It may be *at* or *on* the *lower* side, and therefore *nearness* follows by implication. Like *ab*, *dis*, &c. it sometimes drops the *b* and reiterates the following consonant. *To succeed*, from the Latin *cedere*, is to follow *after*, or to take the place of; and *to supplant* is to plant *under*, or to displace.

Subter. The Latin *subter*, (probably from *sub* and *trans*) like *sub*, signifies *beneath*, but not *near*. It is *below* in opposition to *above*,—not *on* but *separate from* the *lower* side of the *superior* body. *Subter* begins

begins very few English words. *A subterfuge* from *fugere*, to fly, is an evasion,—some covering of which we avail ourselves to escape *under* its shade. *Subterfluent* is flowing *beneath*, as a river *below* a bridge.

The word *under* is also employed as a prefix, and is equivalent to the Latin *sub*,—*immediately beneath*. *Neath*, though not used except in composition, signifies *the bottom*, as does the Dutch *neden* and the German *niedre*. *Under* is contracted from *on-neder*, and signifies *on the bottom*, or *lower side*. Like *sub* it also denotes *near to* but *below*, and marks *inferiority* in degree. *To understand* is to stand *under* or *near*, and consequently *to know* what would otherwise be hidden from view. The Germans express the same idea by the help of the Preposition *ver*, for, and *stehen*, to stand; and have *verstehen*, to understand. *To undertake* is to take something upon one;—to stand *below* it. *To undervalue* is to prize *below* the value; and *underplot* is a plot *subordinate* to another;—secondary and contained *within* the principle scheme. Synonymous with *sub* and *under* is the Greek Preposition *ὑπό*, *hypo*, which we have adopted with some words from that language, as, *hypothesis*, the *thesis* laid *down*, or the basis *over* which any system is erected.

Opposite to *sub* and *under* is the Latin *super*, *super*. *above* and *upon*. When applied to *place*, it is more exalted or higher in the same direction; when to *quantity*

quantity it is greater than,—something more or *above* that of which we were speaking. Like *sub* it implies contiguity. It is *up-on*, that is, *on the upper side*; and, as *subter* implies distance, so, when the Latins supposed a space to intervene they generally employed *supra*. This, however, was not universally attended to, because that such accuracy of distinction was seldom necessary.—The English *upon* and *above* are respectively equivalent to *super* and *supra*; and these also are often used without discrimination. *Supra* does not appear in composition, but we have many words with the prefix *super*. *Superabundance* is an *over* abundance; *to superadd* is to add *still more*; and *supercargo* is one who is placed *over* the cargo and manages the sale.

Epi. *Epi*, among the Greeks, had the same power as the Latin *super* and the English *upon*, though, from the words with which it is connected, it has been variously translated, as, by *at*, *with*, *among*, &c. *Upon* may also have those different significations, according to the general scope of the sentences in which it is found. “I was *upon* the spot” may be also *at* the spot. “It is *upon* the hour” denotes that the hour is *near*, or, as we say, *at hand*. The different Prepositions, in all languages, may often be used in place of each other, agreeably to the manner in which they are applied; but their distinguishing characteristics remain invariably the same. With *epi* we have several words, as *epidemical*, (from *ἐπί*, *demos*, the people,) *among* the

Perhaps *epidemical* is rather *upon*, and *endemical*—
Endemic Disease is in or among the people, not *in* them—
epidemic in their slaves, a

people,—general ; and *epilogue*, (from *λόγος*, *a discourse*,) *a speech upon* or *after* something done, as at the end of a theatrical representation. Sometimes the *i* is suppressed, as in *epact*, *epode*, &c.

The Saxon *ufa*, *ufera*, and *ufemæst*, are equivalent to *up*, *upper* or *over*, and *upmost* or *uppermost*, and these again to *high*, *higher*, and *highest*. *Up* is in use as a prefix. *To uphold* is to hold *up* or *high*,—to keep from falling ; *upon* is *on the up* or *high* side of a thing ; and *upright* is straight *up*, without any deviation from the perpendicular line, and figuratively honest or virtuous.

Over, or *more up*, has the power of the Latin *over*. *super*. It differs from *upon* as being indefinite in degree, whereas *upon* expresses immediate superiority. *To overrate* is to rate *above* its value ; and *to overcome* is to subdue or conquer. When *over* is applied to quantity it signifies excess, as, *to overbalance* is to place more in one scale than balances the other. When applied to distance it denotes extent *beyond* what we speak of ; *to overstep* is to step *beyond*. It is hence nearly synonymous with *trans*, as, “*over the river*” is on the *other* side of the river or *beyond* it. *Over* when connected with motion is from one side to the other, but it traverses by passing *above*, not *through*, the substance or medium ; and it is hence that *to overspread* is to spread so as to *cover* the *upper* surface.

Besides the above we have prefixes from other languages expressive of superiority in height. *Hyper*, *sur*.

To a People in reading but this is often written
in its original — the

the Greek *πέρι*, *over*, *above*, or *beyond*, is found in *hypercritic*, a critic in excess, and in a few other words. The French *sur* is found principally in words derived from that tongue : *A surcharge* is an *overcharge*, or a charge *upon* and *above* one formerly made ; *surfeit*, from *faire*, to make, is to *overdo*, applied chiefly to *overloading* the stomach ; and *to surmount* is to mount or rise *above* another.

*Down and
cata.*

Up and *down* are the reverse of one another. *Up* is *high* and *down* is *low* ; but *high* and *low* are employed as *Adjectives*, while *up* and *down* are *Adverbs*. The etymology of these words has been variously considered. The Latins expressed *low* by *humilis*, *on the ground* ; and the French *bas*, *low*, is also the *lower* part ; — the *base*, *bottom*, or *foundation*. Mr Tooke supposes that the relations of place are generally the names of parts of the human body, as *head*, *toe*, *side*, *back*, &c. ; and as in composition *up*, *top*, and *head*, are equivalent, in *upward*, *topward*, *headward* ; *upmost*, *topmost*, &c. he derives *head*, *heaven*, and *upon*, (*ufon*) from the Anglo-Saxon Verb *heofan*, to heave, or lift *up*. *Down* he believes to be the past Participle, *dusen*, of *dufan*, to sink, dip, or *dive*, varied into *dofen*, *doven*, *doun*, *doun*, and *down*. However this may be, we can be at no loss to fix the meaning of the term. *Downward* is in the direction of *down* or *low* ; *downright* is straight *down*, undeviating ; and *downcast* is cast *down*. *Down* may be either perpendicular or inclined, and hence the direction is

pointed

pointed out by the word that follows, as, “*down the hill*,” “*down stairs*,” &c. On this account it may be often superseded by other Prepositions: “*down the river*” is *along* the course of the stream. The direction of the motion is, *the same*, *with*, *by*, or *according to*, that of the river; and hence the varied translation which is given to some foreign synonymes of *up* and *down*. Of these we may here notice the Greek *cata* which is prefixed to a few of our words, as, *catalogue*, from $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega$, I name, or *number*, a collection of names put *down* in a list.

The Latin, *con* (varied into *co*, *col*, *com*, and *cor*, *con.* according to the initial consonants before which it is prefixed) is an inseparable Preposition signifying *junction*, and answers to our *with* and *together*. *Cum* was used separately, and is also Englished by *with*, the root of the Saxon Verb *withan*, to join. As an Adverb, distinguished by its accentual mark, (*cum*) it is equivalent to *when* or *what time*, and was formerly *quum*. *With* and *when* are perfectly synonymous if applied to Verbs. Two actions happen *together*, *with*, or *at the same time with* one another:—One happens *when*, or *at the time*, that, the other was transacting. *Con* is a very general English prefix. *A coheir* is an heir *along with* another,—*a joint heir*; *to collapse* is to *lapse* or fall *together*; *to compress* is to press *together*; and *to correspond* is to *respond* or answer to one another.

The Greek *syn* is equal to the Latin *con*, of which *syn.* it is the direct origin, *con* being formerly written

cyn. As prefixes in our language they are in no degree different, excepting that the compounds are derived respectively from the separate tongues. Before certain consonants *syn* is spelt *syl* or *sym*. *Symphony*, from *φωνη*, *phone*, a sound, is a concord of musical sounds ; and *synonymous*, from *ὄνομα*, *onoma*, a name, is having *the same* name or signification.

Contra and Counter.

Contra is compounded of *con* and *trans*, and partakes of the meaning of both Prepositions. It implies that two things are *together*, but in such a manner as to be placed *opposite to*, or *over against* each other. The word has also the English form of orthography, and is spelt *counter*, which is used both singly and in composition. *Contradistinction* is the distinction of things particularly *compared* ; and *contradiction* is *opposition* in diction or speech. *Counter* is *opposite* ; *to counteract* is to act *against* or *contrary to* ; and *to counterbalance* is to place an equal weight in the *opposite* scale.

Circum.

From *circus* a circle, or ring, was formed the Latin Preposition *circum*, *about* or *around*. *Bout* is a *turn*, and in Scotland a *circuit* of the wheel. *Circumstances* are things *standing about* or on every side ; and *circumspect*, from *spectare*, to view, is cautious, as if looking at every thing *around* us. *Circum*, like *around*, whether alone or compounded, was generally confined to its literal signification, while *circa* was used in all the secondary senses to which *about* is applied. Both are figuratively put for *near to*, either in *time* or in *place*, but

but it is that sort of *nearness* which cannot be accurately defined ; of which we know not whether it be greater or less, whether it precedes or follows : which as it were *hovers round the center of attraction*. All the other meanings which have been given to these words may be easily resolved into the primary one of *turning in a circle*.

Amphi is a Greek Preposition equivalent to *circa*, ^{*Amphi* and} *about*, but is seldom used as an English prefix. *Amphitheatre* is a *circular* theatre ; and *amphibious* from *βιος*, *bios*, life, is the quality of being able to live by *turns* in the different elements of land and water. The Latin inseparable Preposition *amb*, and the Saxon *emb*, are derivatives from *amphi* ; and the Greek *ampho* and the Latin *ambo*, equivalent to our *both*, are branches of the same stem. It is thence that we have such words as *ambition*, from *ire*, Latin, to go, which, in its primary sense, was merely a *going round* to canvas for votes of office, and *ambidexter*, from *dextra*, the right hand, one who is capable of using his *left* hand equally well as his *right*.

The Greek *peri* also signifies *about*, and figuratively *for* or *concerning*. *Perimeter* is the measure *round* a geometrical figure ; and *periphrasis* is a *round about phrase*, or mode of speaking,—*a circumlocution*. It may here be mentioned that *about*, from the French *bout*, an *extremity*, *end*, or *boundary*, is the line that passes close to the *limits* of a body. It is the *bounding* line whether that line

be

be *circular* or not. The Greek *περι*, *peras*, is also a *bound* or *limit*, and from hence may be the Preposition *peri*. In this view it differs from *circum* or *circa*. We may say indifferently the *circumference* or the *periphery* of a *circle*; which from *φέρω*, and *fero*, to carry, signify the line *drawn round* the *confines* of the *circle*; but in speaking of a square or triangle it were proper to say its *periphery* rather than its *circumference*. In this sort of translation from a foreign language, attention must be paid to the original meaning of the term, independent of that by which it is rendered. It seldom happens that we can explain one vocable by another with sufficient precision. A shade of distinction always arises from their different derivations; and though the resemblance be in most cases correct, yet, occasionally, an anomaly will be found to which our supposed synonyme will be applied in vain.

para.

The Preposition *para* signifies *beside* or *near* to; and as what is *near* may still be considered as *separate from* or at some distance, it also denotes *away from*. The words *aside* and *beside* have occasionally a similar meaning. To *step aside* is to go *away from*, though as it were still *near* to; and of a man whose intellects are deranged we say that “he is *beside himself*.” In both cases we suppose a neighbourhood between the one body and the other, but in one case we attend to their *separation* and in the other to their *approach*. Similar figures are observable in other languages. The German *nach*,

near,

near or *at*, also signifies *after*; and *apres*, *after*, in French is from *a* and *pres*, *near* to. We have compounds of *para* in both its senses. *Parable*, (Latin, *parabola*) from the Greek *βαλλω*, *ballo*, to throw or put, signifies a bringing *together* or *comparison* of things, applied to an allegorical tale; and *paradox*, from *δοξα*, *an opinion*, is a seemingly extravagant assertion,—what is *beyond* belief.

Para or *near* may be applied to *quality* or *appearance*, in which case it will signify *similarity*. From hence comes the Latin *par*, *equal*, *even*, or *alike*. It marks *likeness* such as may be supposed to subsist between a *pair* matched together. *Par* is therefore in composition an *equal*, a *mate*, or a *partner*. *Paramour* is a partner in *love*, from the French *amour*. The relations of *equality* may be differently formed. The Saxon prefix *efen*, *even*, signified *con*, and also *equal* like our *equi*. *Equi* is from the Latin *æquus*, *equal* or *alike*, formed from the Pronouns *ea* and *quis*, *that* *which* or *the same*. Hence we have *equidistant*, having *the same* distance, and *equivalent*, of *the same* value. Sometimes the *i* is dropt before a vowel, as in *equation*, the action of making equal, or the *result* of such an action; and *equanimity*, from the Latin *animus*, the mind, *evenness* or *equality* of mind.

The position of a thing may also be represented by stating that it occupies, or does not occupy, a certain specified situation. In the one case it is *in*, and in the other *out of*, the place mentioned. We

already stated that *in* and *place* are in a certain view synonymous; but this perhaps arises rather from the affinity than the similarity of the original ideas. Words from different sources have nevertheless their occasional points of confluence. *Place* is that portion of space which a body occupies. The Greek $\lambda\gamma\omega$, *lego*, I lie down, forms $\lambda\gamma\cos$, *lechos*, a bed, or *place* to lie in; and hence the Latin *lectus*, of the same signification, and *locus*, *a place*, in general. *To lie* is also spelt *to ly*, and when used actively (that is to say when the *object* is different from the *agent*, for *all* Verbs are *active*,) it is written *to lay*. The Saxon *legan* is both *to lie* and *to lay*, and *lega* is *a place*; as are also the French *lieu*, the Italian *luóga*, and our word *lodge*. Words in *pl*, *pr*, &c. are often formed by contraction from some Preposition (probably Greek $\alpha\pi'$) expressive of existence, like *bl*, *sl*, &c. afterwards to be noticed. The Latin *placare*, to pacify, is literally *to allay*, or put to rest. *Plaudere*, to applaud, differs nothing from *laudare*. *To praise* is *to beraise*, *to lift up*, in the same manner that *extol* is from *ex* and *tollere*. *To place*, then, is *to lay*, and is analogous to *state*, *stead*, and *station*, from the Latin *stare* to stand; and to *situation*, from *situs*, *a site*. *Stall* and *still*, are akin to the German *stellan*, *to place*; and hence *to forestall*, *to install*, &c. The various feelings of the mind are denominated from objects and actions around us. The spirits are *sunk* and *depressed*; or they are *raised* and *exhilarated*; or they *flow* in a *smooth* and *equal stream*. We are *inflamed*

inflamed and *burn* with rage; or we are *cooled* by reason and philosophy. Our passions are *aroused*, *stirred up*, and *awakened*; or they are *settled*, *stilled*, and *lulled to repose*.

The etymologies of *in* and *out* have not yet been satisfactorily investigated. The Saxon *inn*, besides corresponding with the Preposition *in*, signifies a *house*, and particularly a *bedchamber*, like the Latin *cubiculum*. It also denotes any *cell* or *cavern*, and is applied to the *belly* or *interior* of the body. The same word was used, like our *inn*, to express a *house* appropriated to the accommodation and *lodging* of travellers. Of *out* we have not been able to discover a separate or original usage, but its power may be completely ascertained from its *synonymes*, the old French *fors*, the Latin *foras*, and our *forth*, already explained. *In* and *out* are directly the reverse of one another. *In* is *contained* or *housed*; *out* is *forth* or *at the door*. *Out* may be either *near* or *distant*. What is *without* the pale may be either *at* or *away*. It does not necessarily follow that what is *out* has ever been *in*, though this is often supposed by implication. In this case however *out* of is generally applied. The Saxon is *ut*, and, with a similar orthography, we have *utter*, *farther out*, and *utmost*, *farthest out*, or at the greatest distance:—these words are also written *outer*, *outmost*, and *outermost*. In composition *out* may be sometimes explained figuratively by *over* or *beyond*. *To outbid* is to bid *above* or *beyond* another; *outside* is that side of a

Etymolo-
gies of *in*
and *out*.

body which is exposed to what surrounds it or is *outwards*; and *outstanding* is what has not yet been got in,—what stands *without* from where it should be.

E, ex, and extra.

The Greek *εκ*, (*ek*) or *εξ*, (*ex*) and the Latin *e* or *ex*, signify out; but they appear to originate from a word expressing the exclusion under a different form. *Ex* is more properly *out of*:—the body *out* is understood to have been once *within*, or to have formed a part of the other. *Ex* bears the same relation to *off* or *of*, that *in* does to *on*, and in many cases the distinction is imperceptible. When *ex* is applied to a body *formed* from the substance of another, it is in the same style of metaphor that supposes the statue to have previously existed in the block of marble. Most of the compounds from this Preposition are of Latin origin. *Excrescence*, from *crescere*, to grow, is any thing growing *out of* another; *to exclude*, from *cludere*, to close, is to shut *out*; *exit*, from *ire*, to go, is a going *out*, and so of others. *Extra* is a compound of *ex* and *trans*, and signifies *out beyond*. It is translated by *over*, *above*, and such like words: Thus, *extraordinary* is *more than* ordinary; and *extravagant*, from *vagans*, wandering, is going *beyond* bounds.

*A or an; in-
ter, intro, and
enter.*

In a former part of this Introduction we gave examples of *in* as employed in composition; and we have now to notice the same word varied in its appearance. The Saxon *on* means *in*, and from thence we have the prefix *an* before vowels and *a* before consonants. Words of this formation belong

long to the class of Adverbs, as, *aright*, *along*, and *alive*, which answer to the Saxon *on righte*, *on lenge*, and *on life*. *In* is joined to *trans*, forming *inter*, *intra*, and *intro*.—The place expressed by *in* may be surrounded by other bodies; and to get at the situation it may be necessary to go *over*, *through*, or *trans*, the encircling medium, which passage is sometimes denoted in English by *in through*. When two or more bodies are on different sides of it, the *inclosed* object is said to be *between* or *among* these bodies. When the place is supposed to be a cavity, in the center of a continuous substance, we say that the thing contained is *within*. The former of these situations is generally indicated, in Latin, by *inter*, and the latter by *intra* or *intro*. From thence *intrare*, to pierce, or go *in*, and our Verb *to enter*. *To interpose*, is to place *between*; *to introduce* (from *ducere*, to lead,) is to usher *into* a place; and *to enterprize* is to *enter* into a hazardous undertaking.

The significations of many of the Prepositions are peculiarly modified when they refer to *multitude*. They are applicable to *each* and to *all* of the individuals of the group, and, hence, they have both a *distributive* and a *collective* power. “*Through* “*life*” is through *every* period, and to the *conclusion* of existence. “*To go through* the city” may be either to pass from one end to the other, or to visit every street and square. The Prepositions in such cases undergo no change of meaning; for the ambiguity is occasioned by the collective Nouns.

Prepositions connected with collective Nouns.

When this collection is composed of spaces of time, as days, weeks, months, &c. the Prepositions are equivalent to *during* : “ *per multos annos*,” *during* many years. “ *To liye for, out, or through*, a long “ *period*,” and “ *to live during a long period*,” are synonymous. It is only by the known measures of space and time that magnitude and duration can be expressed ; and, when the extent of either is unlimited, the body which should serve as a comparison (*THAT, with, under, above, through, by, or over*, which the other stands or moves,) is left undescribed. *Continual* is from the Latin *con* and *tenere*, to hold together, and denotes an undivided, unbroken succession in space or time, either for a certain length or in general, as the other parts of the sentence shall limit or leave indefinite. “ It “ *moved continually for a year*” signifies that something moved during a year *without stopping*. “ It “ *moves continually*,” or, “ *it shall move continually*,” supposes no period to the motion. *Perpetual*, from *perpetuare*, Latin, to go *through*, has a similar usage. “ *To move perpetually*,” is to move *onwards* to the end, *without interruption*. *Ever* is equal to *over* in the sense of the Latin *perpes*, that is, *perpetual*, *entire*, or *going through the whole*. *Every* is *over*, attending to *each* individual. *Ever* is seldom confined in its signification, but, when it is so, it refers to some *whole* which is expressed or understood. “ *If ever I meet him*” is, if I meet him *at any point over* the general extent of time.

“ *Wherever*

“Wherever I meet him,” is *over* what place he may travel. In composition *over* is usually synonymous with *perpetual* or *always*: *everlasting* is *continual*; and *everduring* is *always* enduring.

To whatever depth we may push our metaphysical abstractions; and however much, from the play of words, we may imagine ourselves to be wise when we are only profound, a slight inquiry into the origin of terms would easily point the path to reason and nature. Those words in all languages which have been supposed to convey the idea of *endless duration* are derived from the expressions of *time*. The Greek *αἰών*, *aion*, and the Latin *ævum*, indicate, in their literal sense, an *age* or *period of action*; and are often employed to denote *finite duration*. *Æternitas*, from *ævum* (*αἰών*) and *trans*, is, in its origin, a long period, or *beyond* an age. *Always* is *in all ways*. *Ever*, *perpetual*, and *continual* have been already explained. Attention to this unvaried application of language to what is cognizable by the senses, may be highly useful in tracing the extent of its figurative dominion; and these observations will not here be deemed impertinent, when it is recollected that no words have given rise to more unmeaning and useless discussions, than those that refer to consciousness or life, which is the subject of the succeeding article.

It is not to be presumed as probable that the formation of language was the result of speculative investigation. The peasants of the rude ages of society,

society, in stating that any particular person or thing *lived* or *lay* in their neighbourhood, could have none of those perplexing and half-meaning ideas which constitute the jargon of the schools. They must have contented themselves with simply asserting an *existence*, leaving its *substratum* and its *modes* to be explained by future philosophers. The fact is, that *being* and *life* are generally denominated by words expressive of *posture* and *situation*. *Exist* is a compound of the Latin *ex* and *sisto* or *sto*, I stand. We have adopted our word *state* directly from *stare*, while the French *estre*, to be, and *estat*, state, are formed from *esse* and *existere*, both signifying *to be*. The Latin *vivere*, and its English *to live*, express the *existence* of *animated* objects; or of such as are supposed to be so, from the criterions referred to by common observers,—*motion* and the necessity of *nourishment* or food. It is hence that the compounds, in both languages, are indicative of *activity* and *briskness*, as well as of the *means* by which existence is prolonged. *Quick* is opposed to *dead*;—it also denotes *agility* of motion, and *motion* opposed to *rest*. *Being*, when opposed to nonentity, is not necessarily connected with *life*. It marks only that the object to which it refers *is to be found* in nature, without asserting or denying its *animation*. *To be* and *by* were, in the Saxon and in the earlier periods of our tongue, of indiscriminate orthography; and their meaning is the same, excepting that the latter spelling is now used

to

to the literal signification. *By* is *at the side of*, and, when applied as a Verb, (*to be*) it is *to stand beside one*; an idea scarcely in the least degree differing from *to exist*. It was in a similar metaphor that the Romans expressed *death* by a *separation*, or leaving the scene of our knowledge; for *exire*, to go out, from *ex* and *ire*, to go, also signified *to die*. What are termed Substantive Verbs in all languages originate in a similar manner with the Verb *to be*. *Id erat* in Latin, *il etoit* in French, and *it was* in English, all assert that *something* of which we were speaking *stood* or *lay*, at some past time, in some particular place; but the expression is *general*, for *what* the thing was, and *when* or *where* it was to be found, is left to be explained by other parts of the sentence.

It is with *be* as a prefix that we are here chiefly concerned; and, in this situation, it has both the varieties of meaning which we have ascribed to *be* or *by*. They are indeed but different views of the same definition, and, on a close inspection, we are unable to draw the line of distinction. *To beware* is *to be aware*; *beside* is *by the side of*; and *to befriend* is *to be the friend of*. In the Saxon almost every Verb had its compound with this prefix; and, like our *to* as the mark of action, it served in most cases merely to state the *existence* of what the Verb expressed. *To, too, be*, and *by*, have an evident fraternity. It is thus that we are to account for such Verbs as *to bedaub*, *to besprinkle*, *to bespatter*,

bespatter, &c. which differ from their primitives, *to daub*, *to sprinkle*, and *to spatter*, only in referring directly to the *object* of the action, while the latter point more immediately to the *means*. Thus, it were better to *besprinkle* the floor with vinegar, and to *sprinkle* vinegar *on* the floor:—*be*, in this case signifying *upon*, is equivalent to *by*.

Bl and br. When the prefix *be* is followed by *l* or *r*, there are some instances in which the *e* is suppressed, and the *b* is blended with the succeeding consonant. Thus *black*, from its expressing the *absence* of colour, may be compounded of *be* and *lack*, or *wanting*; and a derivation of *night* is almost obvious, which would strengthen the supposition by analogy. It may be thus that *blæcan*, in Saxon, has two significations apparently opposite. It is not only *to blacken*, but *to bleach* or *whiten*. If our observations be just it denotes neither, but merely *to take away*; and, when applied to colour, may be either *to make black* or *white* according to circumstances. *Bleak* mountains are such as bear no vegetation. *To block* is the Saxon *belucan*, to shut or *lock* up. *Brim* and *rim* are synonymous.

With *With* is equivalent to the Latin *cum* and the English *join*. In the Gothic it is the imperative of the Verb *withan*, to join, and in the Saxon of *wyrthan*, to be or become; for in addition to its meaning of *beside*, it was also, like *by*, used to signify *existence*. As prefixes the Saxons understood *with* and *be* in the same sense, and sometimes they used

used them indiscriminately, as *beforan* and *withforan*, for *before*; *beutan* and *withutan* for *without* and *but*, and so of others. *Without* is therefore *be out or out by*, expressive of being in company *with* another but *by, at, or on* the *outside*, and not *in* the the same place. *With*, like *con*, sometimes signifies *against*, but this use is figurative and common to some of the other Prepositions, as *ob, anti, &c.* Such shades of meaning depend entirely on the context. Thus, “to fight *with* one” may be to fight *against* him, provided there be no other *opponent* in the field; but it may also denote fighting on the *same* side, as when we say “I fought *with* “ him *against* our enemies.” It is thus that we are to explain *to withstand, to withhold*, and the like.

The root *es* of the French *estre*, to be, performs the same part as a prefix to Verbs in that language as *be* and *with* in the Saxon and English:—it is *to be, make, or become* what the additional word denotes. Thus from *changer*, to change, they have *eschanger, to exchange, to change by or with* another. *Clair* is light, clear, or shining, and *esclairer* is *to enlighten*. This prefix has so generally prevailed among the French; and when speaking of a thing the addition of *to, be, es, or any other mark* of its *existence*, causes, in many cases, so little alteration in the sense of the original vocable, that the compound often remains while its root is no more to be found. This together with the elision of vowels may account for many of our words in *bl,*

*Es and sp,
st, &c.*

br;

br; *st*, *sp*, &c. being considered as primitives; while, could we investigate their origin, they might be found to be compounded. *Squadron*, for instance, is the French *esquadron* or *escadron*, and means a number of men, or other things, disposed in the form of a *square*, or *cadre*, from *quatre* or *quadre*, four. *Square* is from *esquarrir* to make *square* or *quarré*; that is, to form a figure with *four* sides. Hence we speak of “*a perfect square*,” denoting that the sides are *equal*; though oftener the *equality* is presumed, in the same manner that “*to quarter a circle*” supposes an *equal* division. *Strange* with us signifies uncommon and unknown. The French *estrangé* is literally *distant*, from *es* and the Latin *trans*, to be *distant* or *beyond*; and hence it is applied to what is *foreign* (*without doors*) or belonging to another nation. *Estranger*, the Verb, is *to chase away*.

Es, and *ex*
compared.

Comparing *es* with *ex* we find a considerable resemblance. *Eschanger* is Englished by *to exchange*, and *estrange* is synonymous with *extraneus*. *To expend*, from the Latin *pendere*, to weigh, is the same with *to spend*, and *expedition*, from *pes*, the foot, is equivalent to *speed*. May we not then conjecture that *ex*, *out* and *esse*, to be, are the same? To state that a thing *exists*, or *is*, we must serve ourselves with the expressions of place; and, in making such an assertion, we merely say that the thing *exists*, or *is beside, with, out, or in any way different from ourselves*.

It is pleasing to observe the coincidence between language and philosophy. *Negatives* are incapable of expressing any abstract idea of *nonentity*, because no such power of abstraction belongs to the human mind. They either *take away* the substance of which we speak, and then as to us *nothing* remains; or, by a process analogous to the infinitesimals of the Mathematician, they mark the *zero* of existence, by *the least* of observable objects. The Greek inseparable Preposition *νε*, the Latin Adverb *ne*, and our *no*, denote the *absence* or *want* of that to which they refer. They are the opposite of *present* or *possession*, expressed by *aye*, *yes*, or *be*. *Aye*, *yea*, and *yes*, are the French Imperatives *aye* and *ayez*, have thou and have ye, of the Verb *avoir*, to have. “Give or grant me this.” “Yes”—“have it.”—“No”—“away with it.” It is thus that we indicate *assent* or *denial*. That *absence* is the true meaning of the Latin *ne* may be admitted from its correspondence with the Conjunction *lest*, which arises from the Saxon *lesan*, to *dismiss* or *send away*. In French, *ne* and *non* require some qualifying additions in order to express complete *negation*. *Pas*, a step, is a single movement and denotes the *smallest* motion;—*ne pas*, is *not a step*. *A point* is the *least* mark, and figuratively *little* or *nothing*, like *iota* (and *jet*) the name of the Greek letter *ι*;—*ne point* is *none*, *not a iota*. This kind of double negative was formerly used in English—“He *ne* did *not*” is a common phrase in

Chaucer;

Chaucer ; and we have still similar modes of writing, as, “ *not at all* ;” “ *not in the least*,” &c. *No* and *not* have different forms of usage. *No* is applied to express the *negation of things* ; and *not* to express that of *actions*. *No* has the effect of an Adjective ; and *not* of an Adverb. When we say, “ *he has not money*,” we assert that he is *destitute* of money, in opposition to those who say or believe that he *has it* :—Here the *not* is applied to the Verb *has*. But when we say, “ *he has no money*,” we allude to no opinion of others, but use *no* merely in opposition to *some* :—In this case *no* is an Adjective to the word *money*.

Ne, neg, no, and non. We have privative Prefixes from some of the Negatives above mentioned. *Ne* is connected with a few words. *Necessity* from the Latin *cedere* to yield or give place to, is what *cannot be set aside* ; *need* is *neth, no-ness* or *want* ; and *never* is *ne-ever*. The Latin *nec* or *neque* is *not that*, and hence (transforming the *c* into *g*) is *negare*, to deny. *Negation* and *negative* are from this source ; and, from *legere*, to gather, was formed the Latin Verb *negligere*, to *neglect*. The inseparable Preposition *non* is equivalent to *not*, as in *nonexistence, nonsense, nonresidence*, &c. the composition of which is obvious. *No* appears in *nothing, nowhere, &c.*

Mis. The Latin *missus*, thrown away, is probably the origin of our Verb *to miss*, which signifies to *throw wide of the mark*—to send the arrow *away from* the point where it should hit. In a consequent sense, when

when we do not find a thing where we expected it to be, we say we *miss* it. A man *misses* his money when he looks for it after it is gone, and *misses* his friend when that friend cannot be found at the time he has need of his services. *Amiss* is *away from* the *right* path, and figuratively *criminal*; a meaning which is also given to other words that indicate *irregularity* of course. To go *astray* is to *wander* from our road; it is also to do *wrong* or be *vicious*. *Error* is from the Latin *errare*, to go out of the way, and signifies a *mistake* in moral conduct. Human life has, in all ages and nations, been compared to a journey which we may perform well or ill. *Conduct* is the guidance of our travels, and *morals* is synonymous with *ways*. It is in this sense that we use *mis* as a prefix. *Misconduct* is *wrong* conduct, and to *misapply* is to apply improperly.

Right is the Latin *rectus*, the past Participle of *recte* and *regere*, to govern. The Saxon is *reht*, and *rehtan* *orthos*. is *regere*, to direct or rule; to order and guide the course, or to point out the path that ought to be followed. A *ruler* or *regulator*, is the person or thing that marks the road which we should tread. *Right* or *rectus* is therefore undeviating. It is also *straight* and *regular*, opposed to *crooked* and *perverse*. *Wrong* is an old past Participle of the Verb *to wring*, and *tort*, its equivalent in French, is from the Latin *tortus*, *crooked* or *twisted*. *Rect* and *recti* are prefixes. *Rectilinear* is straight lined, and *rectitude* is the same with *righteousness*. *Ortho*, *from*

from the Greek *ορθός*, *straight*, has a similar meaning. *Orthography*, from *γράφω*, I write, is accurate writing; and *orthodoxy*, from *δοξα*, *doxa*, a dogma, denotes *true belief*.

Male, atra, and melan.

By an easy transition, *right* and *wrong* are also expressive of *good* and *evil*. The latter, however, are often denoted by other metaphors. “ Among most nations *black*, the colour of darkness, has been associated with the ideas of *crime* or *misfortune*, and *white* with *innocence* and *happiness*. The modern Greeks indifferently use the word *maleinos* to signify a *black* or an *unhappy* man. An East Indian who has committed a *fault* says, with shame, that he is *black*. The *Black Sea* has acquired its name only because of the frequent *shipwrecks* on its coasts. The Turks attribute ill omens to the colour of *black*, and view it with *repugnance*. The Europeans *mourn*, and array the Ministers of Religion and Justice, who are equally supposed to have renounced pleasure, in *black*.* *Noxious*, *hurtful*, is an *Adjective* from the Latin *nox*, *night*. The *Prefix male* signifies *evil*. *Malecontents* are those who are *ill contented*, and *maleadministration* is a *bad* or *wrong* administration. The word is Latin from the Greek *μέλας*, *melas*, *black*, a compound of *μέλας*, *melas*, *nat*, and *λαμψις*, *the light of the Sun*. In a figurative sense it was *evil* or *depraved*. The Latin *ater*, *black*, *dark*,

* CHENIER'S ACCOUNT OF MOROCCO.

dark, gloomy, &c. has an origin similar to our word *black*; it is the Greek Adverb *ἄτερ*, *ater*, *without* or *wanting*. It is thence that we have *atrocious*, *cruel*, and *atrabilarious*, *having a gloomy mind*. *Atrabilious* is literally *black bile*, and *melancholy*, from the Greek, has exactly the same signification. *Black bile* was supposed by the ancients to form a peculiar temperament.

The prefix *bene* is the Latin Adverb *bene*, *well* *Bene and eu* or *rightly*, from *bonus*, *good*, as *male* is from *malus*, *evil*. *Benediction*, from *dicere*, *to speak*, is speaking *well*, or *blessing*; and *benefactor*, from *facio*, *I do*, is a *friend*, or one who does *good* offices. The Latin termination *ignus* expresses quality like *ine* in *canine*, &c. formerly explained. It is sometimes Englished by *ign*, as in *malign* or *benign*, having an *evil* or a *good* disposition. *Eu* is a Latin Interjection and a Greek Adverb, both equivalent to *bene*, and is prefixed to a few English words. *Eulogy* is a speaking *well* of, or in praise of another, and *euphony* is an agreeable sound.

The residence of mankind in society has also furnished names for *virtue* and *vice*. The metropolis of an empire, being the seat of its rulers, has always either possessed, or pretended to possess, a refinement of manners, superior to the rustic inhabitants around it. The Greek *πόλις*, *polis*, a town, is from *πολύς*, *many*; and the Latin *civis*, a citizen, is derived from *coire* to assemble. *Urbs* (perhaps from *orbis*, a circle) is a city *surrounded* with walls.

Residence
indicative of
character.

All these have their derivatives expressive of elegance and the mutual charities of life. We have *politeness*, *urbanity*, *civility*, *civilization*, &c. *Courteous* is possessing the manners of a *court*; and *to polish* is likewise applied to the *smoothing*, or removing of the *rugged* inequalities, of material objects. On the contrary, the inhabitants of the country have been stigmatized as *rude*, *ignorant*, and *brutal*; and, among the Greeks and Romans, *βαρβαρος*, (*barbaros*) and *barbarus*, a *barbarian*, which literally meant a *foreigner*, was charged, by implication, with all the *ignorance* and *vice* of which they were accustomed to accuse their enemies. He was *foolish* and *stupid*; *savage* and *cruel*.

Vice.

The Latin *vicus*, from *vincire*, to join together, denoted a collection of houses in the country. Its diminutive *villa* was applicable to a single house, the habitation of the farmer. From this we have formed *village*, a junction of rural habitations, equivalent to *vicus*. In their general style of contempt for every thing without the walls of the city, the Romans had *vitium*, *vitiis*, *viliis*, and others, which we have adopted in *vice*, *vicious*, *vile*, &c. A *villain* in our law books is simply an inhabitant of a *village*,—one who is the *vassal* of his Lord. In its ordinary acceptation it includes every *vice*. The derivatives of *vincire* are numerous. In one view it becomes *vincere*, to *vanquish*; and hence *victory*, *conquest*, and *victim*, the prisoner, who was *bound* in chains. A *vice* is an instrument for holding or pressing

Vide
To BIND.

pressing things *together*. *Vicinity* is neighbourhood, and *vicissitude* is interchange of *place* or situation. The latter is from the Latin Adverb *vicissim*, by turns. The original idea expressed by *vicissim* is *together*, *jointly*, or *conjoined*; but separate acts thus performed, or two events, of an *opposite* nature, thus recorded, must necessarily suppose *alternation*. The *vicissitudes* of *heat* and *cold* are their *conjunction*; but the *conjunction* of such impressions must be of that kind which tread on the heels of one another. *Vicus*, *village*, and *place*, are similar.—The Latin *vice* is, therefore, *in place* or *instead of*, and is prefixed to several words, as, *viceroy*, from the French *roy*, a king, one who rules *in place* of a king.

Our account of the prefixes now draws to a close. In addition to what we have mentioned, many words are employed for that purpose, which will fall to be explained in the body of the work; for they do not differ, in composition, from their primitive power. Of these are *life*, *hand*, *foot*, *high*, *low*, *land*, *house*, and a multitude of others, as exemplified in *liferent*, *handsome*, *football*, *highway*, *lowbred*, *landholder*, *housewife*, &c. They present a conjunction of roots, and the definition may be referred to either class. We have likewise a number of words, adopted from foreign languages, which are formed in a similar manner; but the meaning of each part is so well ascertained, and they are, besides, applied in so few cases, that a

Nouns and
Adjectives
used as Pre-
fixes.

simple translation will be sufficient for our purpose. The following are all which at present we think it necessary to notice, — giving an example of each. The others will be found under some of their roots, in the order of the Dictionary :—

Similar
Greek com-
pounds.

From the Greek ἄνθρωπος, *anthropos*, a man, and φάγος, *phagos*, a devourer, we have *anthropophagi*, man-eaters. From ἀστέρ, *aster*, a star, and ὄνομα, *onoma*, a name, is formed *astronomy*, the science of the stars. *Geography*, the description of the *earth*, is from γῆ, *ge*, the earth, and γράφει, I write. From ὁμος, *homos*, alike, and γένος, *genos*, kind, we have *homogeneous*, of the same kind; and from ἀλλος, *heteros*, another, we have *heterogeneous*, of a different kind. *Hierarchy*, a government of the priesthood, is derived from ἱερεύς, *hiereus*, a priest or sacred person. *Hydrophobia*, the canine madness, in which the dread of water is said to constitute the chief symptom, is compounded of ὕδωρ, *hydor*, water, and φόβος, *phobos*, fear. From μίσεο, *miseo*, I hate, and φίλεω, *phileo*, I love, are formed *misanthrope*, a hater, and *philanthropist*, a lover, of mankind. *Zoology*, the description of *animals*, is from ζωος, *zoos*, living, or ζων, an animal.

Compounds
of Latin
Nouns.

From the Latin *aqua*, water, we have *aqueous*, watery; *aqueduct* a water course, and some others. From *manus*, the hand, we have *manuscript*, handwriting. From *cælum*, the heavens, and *terra*, the earth, are formed the Adjectives *celestial* and *terrestrial*, heavenly and earthly. The Arabic Particle *al* signifies *the*. It is prefixed to several words brought

brought from the East; as, *alcoran*, *the koran*, or *bible* of the Mahometans, from *karaa*, to read. *Al koran*, is *the Reading*, a title of eminence, corresponding to *the Scripture (the Writing)* of the Jews and Christians. The prefix *pur* is the French *pour*. It is synonymous with *for*, and ought to have been noticed when treating of that Preposition. *To purpose* is *to place for* or *on account of*, that is *to intend for*; *pursuit*, from the French *suivre*, to follow, is following *for*, or in chase of; and *purlieus*, from *lieu*, a place, is the *fore places*, *environs*, or *outskirts* of any inclosure or other specified situation.

Pur.

At the conclusion of our introductory labours, we may be allowed to anticipate, and to apologise for, some of the faults of which they will be accused. Didactic works are, in general, either too laconic for the ignorant, or too garrulous for the learned; and it is, probably, impossible to satisfy both classes in the same production. The sin that most easily besets a writer is prolixity, but here it was, in many places, unavoidable. In treating of subjects hitherto but little attended to, it was necessary to dwell on the proofs of what might otherwise be rejected as fanciful; and yet, after all, much illustration has been suppressed, lest the more instructed Reader should yawn over a twice-told tale. It were, perhaps, better for an Author who hopes for the approbation of the Public, to

Conclusion.

limit

limit his excursions into unfrequented ground; but Etymology is one of the tractless wilds of Nature; —while we stray we are allured by the charms of novelty: we wander from shrub to shrub, and from tree to tree, till we can no longer recover the beaten path which surrounds without entering the forest.

FINIS.

INDEX.

A

	Page
A , a privative Prefix, explained	111
—, or An , a Prefix forming Adverbs	140
—, Ab or Ab<i>s</i> , a Prefix	110, 112
ABLE , a Termination	78
ABLY , —————	82
ABSTRACTION , nature of	17
ACCENTS , of	41
ACCUSATIVE Case	37, 107
ACE , a Termination	93
AD , a Prefix	111
—, ADE , or ADO , a Termination	95
ADJECTIVES , of	16, 72, 155
ADVERBS , of	19, 35, 86, 140
AFTER , definition of	34
AGE , a Termination	89
AL , a Prefix	156
—, a Termination	77
AMB and AMPHI , Prefixes	185
An , a Prefix	111, 140
— a Termination	35
ANA , a Prefix	121
—, a Termination	36
ANCE and ANT , Terminations	74
ANTE and ANTI , Prefixes	125
ANTHROPO , a Prefix	156
APO , —————	110
AQUA , —————	156
AR , a Termination	77
ARCH , a Prefix and Termination	103
ARD , a Termination	97

	Page
ARTICLES, of	21, 59
ARY, a Termination	82
AS, distinguished from So	53
ASTER, a Prefix	156
ATE, ATION, ATOR, &c. Terminations	93
ATRA, a Prefix	152
B	
B, the letter	46, 64
BE, a Verb and Prefix	143
— contracted into BL and BR	146
BENE, a Prefix	153
BI or BIS, a Prefix	115
BLACK, its etymology, &c.	146, 152
C	
C, the letter	46, 61
— and CH, Terminations in	79, 91
CŒLUM, a Prefix	156
CASES, account of	33, 107
CATA, a Prefix	132
CAUSE, expressions of	123
CE, a Termination	25, 102
CENT, a Prefix	116
CHIEF, a Termination	101
CIDE and CIDAL, Terminations	96
CIRCUM, a Prefix	134, 136
CLE, a Termination	83
CON, a Prefix	133
CONJUNCTIONS, of	22
CONTRA and COUNTER, Prefixes	134
D	
D, the Letter	45
DE, a Prefix	112
DECA,	

				Page
DECA and DECEM, Prefixes	—	—	—	116
DEMI, a Prefix	—	—	—	114
DI, or DIS, a Prefix	—	—	—	113
DI _A , —	—	—	—	116
DIMINUTIVES, of	—	—	—	83
DO, explanation of	—	—	18, 45, 46, 60	
DOM, a Termination	—	—	—	99
DOWN, etymology of,	—	—	—	132

E

E or ex, a Prefix	—	—	—	140, 148
ED, a Termination	—	—	—	28, 68, 69
EE, —	—	—	—	56
EL, —	—	—	—	85, 93
EMPHASIS, of	—	—	—	39
EN, a Prefix and Termination	—	—	—	26, 32, 68
ENCE, END, and ENT, Terminations	—	—	—	74
ENTER, a Prefix	—	—	—	140
EPI, —	—	—	—	130
EQUI, —	—	—	—	137
ER, a Termination	—	—	—	57, 58, 61, 73
ERN, —	—	—	—	29
ERY, —	—	—	—	82
Es, —	—	—	—	24, 27, 68
—, a Prefix	—	—	—	147
—, contracted, forming SP, ST, &c.	—	—	—	148
EsQUE, a Termination	—	—	—	80
Ess, —	—	—	—	57
EST, —	—	—	—	68, 73
ET or ETTE, a Termination	—	—	—	85
ETH, —	—	—	—	68
EU, a Prefix	—	—	—	153
EUR, a Termination	—	—	—	58
EVER, and other marks of indefinite Duration	—	—	—	142
Ex and EXTRA, Prefixes	—	—	—	140

F

F, the Letter	—	—	—	46, 53, 64
FOR, and FORE, definition of,	—	—	—	122
FREQUENTATIVES in LE, &c.	—	—	—	94
FROM, definition of	—	—	—	34, 109, 112
FUL, or FULL, a Termination	—	—	—	88
FY and its compounds, Terminations	—	—	—	104

G

G, the Letter	—	—	—	46, 61, 65
—, terminations in,	—	—	—	79
GE, a Prefix and Termination	—	—	—	91
GENDER, of,	—	—	—	57
GENITIVE CASE, of the	—	—	—	33
GEO, a Prefix	—	—	—	156
GHT, a Termination	—	—	—	70
GRAMMAR, in general	—	—	—	9

H

H, the Letter	—	—	—	51
HEAD and HEADED, Terminations	—	—	—	97, 100
HEARTED, a Termination	—	—	—	97
HEMI, a Prefix	—	—	—	114
HEPTA, —	—	—	—	115
HERE and its compounds explained	—	—	—	48
HETERO, a Prefix	—	—	—	156
HEX, —	—	—	—	115
HIER, —	—	—	—	156
HOLO, —	—	—	—	116
HOMO, —	—	—	—	156
HOOD, a Termination	—	—	—	100
How, definition of,	—	—	—	52
HYDRO, a Prefix	—	—	—	156
				HYPER,

					Page
HYPER, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	131
HYPO, —	—	—	—	—	129

I

IBLE, a Termination	—	—	—	—	78
IC, ICK, IQUE, and ICAL, Terminations	—	—	—	—	80
ID, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	47
—, a Termination	—	—	—	—	69
IFF, —	—	—	—	—	93
IGN, —	—	—	—	—	153
ILE, —	—	—	—	—	77
IN, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	30, 130
—, a Termination	—	—	—	—	36
INE, —	—	—	—	—	36, 85
INCLE, —	—	—	—	—	83
ING, —	—	—	—	—	75
INTER and INTRO, Prefixes	—	—	—	—	140
INTERJECTIONS, of	—	—	—	—	23
INTERROGATION, of	—	—	—	—	50
Is, a Termination	—	—	—	—	24, 33
ISE, or IZE, ISM, and IST, Terminations	—	—	—	—	92
ISH, a Termination	—	—	—	—	80, 83, 90
IT, definition of	—	—	—	—	45
ITE, a Termination	—	—	—	—	92
ITY, —	—	—	—	—	102
IVE, —	—	—	—	—	93
Ix, —	—	—	—	—	57

K

K, the Letter	—	—	—	—	46, 61
—, Terminations in	—	—	—	—	79
KE, a Prefix and Termination	—	—	—	—	91
KIN, a Termination	—	—	—	—	84

		Page
	L	
L, the Letter	—	64
LANGUAGE, of, in general	—	10, 66, 98
LE, a Termination	—	93
LESS, —————	—	88
LET, —————	—	84
LETTERS, of, in general	—	45, 61, 63
LIKE, a Termination	—	82
LING, —————	—	84
LY, —————	—	82
	M	
M, the Letter	—	63
—, a Termination	—	38
MAGNA, a Prefix	—	116
MALE, —————	—	152
MANU, —————	—	156
MENT, a Termination	—	76
META, a Prefix	—	117
MICRO, —————	—	116
MILLE, —————	—	116
MIS, —————	—	150
MISEO, —————	—	156
MONO, —————	—	115
MONY, a Termination	—	76
MOODS, of	—	70
MOST, a Termination	—	74
MULTI, a Prefix	—	116
	N	
N, the Letter	—	63
NE, a Prefix	—	150
NEG, —————	—	150
NEGATIVES, of	—	149
		NESS,

	Page
Ness, a Termination	101
No, distinguished from Nor	150
—, a Prefix	150
Non, —	150
NOUNS, of	15, 36, 155
NUMERAL Prefixes	114
O	
Ob, a Prefix	126
OBJECTIVE Case	37
OCTA or OCTO, a Prefix	115
Of and OFF, explained	84, 112
OMNI, a Prefix	116
On, a Termination	89
OON, —	85
Or and OUR, Terminations	57
ORTHO, a Prefix	151
ORY, a Termination	82
OSE, —	95
Ous, —	85
OUT, a Prefix	137, 139
OVER, —	131
Ow, a Termination	91
P	
P, the Letter	46, 64
PAN, a Prefix	116
PAR, —	137
PARA, —	136
PARTICIPLES, of	20, 75
PENTA, a Prefix	115
PER, —	116
PERI, —	135
PHILO, —	156
PL, PR, &c. Prefixes	138
PLURAL	

	Page
PLURAL Terminations	24
POLY, a Prefix	116
POSSESSIVE Case	33, 42
POST, a Prefix	121
PRE, —	126
PREFIXES, of	23, 108
PREPOSITIONS, of	22, 105, 141
PRETER, a Prefix	127
PRO, —	126
PRONOUNS, of	20, 43
PUR, a Prefix	157
Q	
Q, the Letter	46
QUADRI or QUADRUS, a Prefix	115
QUINQUE and QUINTUS, Prefixes	115
R	
R, the Letter	64
RE, a Prefix	118, 121
RECTI, a Prefix	151
RETRO, —	120
RICK, a Termination	62
S	
S, the Letter	46, 61, 64
—, a Termination	24, 35, 68, 86
'S, the sign of the Genitive	33
SCAPE, a Termination	101
SE, a Prefix	114
SELF, a Termination	54
SEMI, a Prefix	114
SEPT, —	115
SEX, —	115
SHIP, a Termination	101
Skip,	

INDEX.

ix

					Page
SKIP, a Termination	—	—	—	—	101
So, definition of	—	—	—	—	53
SOLI, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	116
SOME, a Termination	—	—	—	—	87
STALL, —	—	—	—	—	138
STEAD, —	—	—	—	—	99
STEP, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	99
STER, a Termination	—	—	—	—	58
SUB, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	128
SUBTER, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	128
SUPER, —	—	—	—	—	129
SUR, —	—	—	—	—	131
SYN, —	—	—	—	—	133

T

T, the Letter	—	—	—	—	45
TENSES, of	—	—	—	—	68
TERMINATIONS, of	—	—	—	—	23, 105
TERRA, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	156
TETRA, —	—	—	—	—	115
TH, Pronouns in explained	—	—	—	—	45
—, a Termination	—	—	—	—	102
TIDE, —	—	—	—	—	25
TIME, of	—	—	—	—	25, 29
To, definition of	—	—	—	18, 45, 60, 109	
TRANS, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	117
TRE or TRI, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	115
TUDE, a Termination	—	—	—	—	102
TY, —	—	—	—	—	102

U

ULE and ULOUS, Terminations	—	—	—	—	83
UN, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	32
UNDER, a Prefix	—	—	—	—	129
UNI, —	—	—	—	—	115

UP,

		Page
UP, a Prefix	—	131
URE, a Termination	—	59
V		
V, the Letter	—	46, 53, 64
VERBS, of	—	17, 67
VICE, a Prefix	—	154
VOWELS, of	—	65, 103
W		
W, the Letter	—	52
WARD, a Termination	—	96
WAYS, —	—	85
WH, Pronouns in, explained	—	49
WHEN and WITH, connection between	—	133
WISE, a Termination	—	85
WITH, a Prefix	—	146
—, its connection with WHEN	—	133
WORDS, of, in general	—	11, 14
Y		
Y, the Letter	—	65
—, a Prefix	—	91
—, a Termination	—	81
Z		
Z, the Letter	—	46, 61, 66
ZOO, a Prefix	—	156



14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below,
or on the date to which renewed. Renewals only:

Tel. No. 642-3405

Renewals may be made 4 days prior to date due.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

NOV 24 1970 47

RECD LD NOV 10 1970 2 PM 04

APR 30 1971 14

RECD LD JUN 10 1971 2 PM 36

LD21A-60m-8, '70
(N8837s10)476—A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley



